THE EVOLUTION OF NEW TESTAMENT CHRISTOLOGY

CHARLES B. WILLIAMS

THE WATCHWORD
1080 U. B. BUILDING
DAYTON, OHIO

THE EVOLUTION OF NEW TESTAMENT CHRISTOLOGY

THE EVOLUTION OF NEW TESTAMENT CHRISTOLOGY

CHARLES B. WILLIAMS, Ph. D., D. D.,

Professor of New Testament Interpretation, Union University, Jackson, Tennessee; Author of The Function of Teaching in Christianity; New Testament History and Literature; An Introduction to Christian Ethics, etc., etc.

BT
198
.W43
1928

BOSTON
RICHARD G. BADGER, PUBLISHER
THE GORHAM PRESS

Copyright, 1928, by Richard G. Badger

All Rights Reserved

Printed in the United States of America

The Gorham Press, Boston, U. S. A.

DEDICATED

To my students in Theology who have spurred me on to patient research in these truths for the glory of Our Lord Jesus Christ.

PREFACE

The question of the ages is, Who is Jesus? The emphasis of modern scholars upon the historical, scientific, and psychological methods of religious investigation makes it necessary to study the person and mission of Jesus by application of historical, scientific, and psychological methods to the development of New Testament Christology. This has been the aim of the author in the following pages.

In part I, the literary sources have been determined, with approximate dates accepted. In this way it is possible for us to trace the development of the Christology of the New Testament from the earliest Christian documents, the Logia and the Gospel of Mark, to the latest, the Johannine Gospel, Epistle, and Apocalypse.

In chapter II, the historical background has been unveiled in a study of the origin and growth of the messianic idea and person in Jewish literature, and of the hope of a World-Deliverer as expressed in the pagan religions. In chapter III the psychological principles controlling the early disciples and the later Christology makers have been discussed.

In part II, the process of developing the ideas of the person and work of Jesus as held by the early disciples and the later Christology makers has been studied. By use of the "historical-literary" method each portrait of Jesus, from the fragmentary picture of the Logia and the "snap-shot" of Mark's Gospel; from the simpler Christologies of Matthew, the Epistle of James, the early chapters of Acts, and First Peter, to the higher Christologies of Luke, Paul, the author of Hebrews, and the author, or authors, of the Johannine writings. In this historical study the process of development in New Testament Christology is shown to be prominent. It is hoped that our study will be convincing to all who read it that there is progress in the unfolding of the early and later Christians' impressions and conceptions of Jesus, from the Logia sketch to the Johannine Christology; that all who read, or study, this treatise may be re-assured in their faith in the historical Jesus who is the Son of God and the Saviour of men.

CONTENTS

Preface 5

PART I—Literary Sources, Historical Background, Psychological Principles

CHAPTER I

Literary Sources 9

CHAPTER II

The Development of the Messianic Idea and Person 27

CHAPTER III

The Psychology of the Christological Development 50

PART II—The Process of Christological Development

CHAPTER IV

The Earliest Picture of Jesus the Christ 67

CHAPTER V

A "Snap-Shot" of Jesus the Son 78

CHAPTER VI

The Picture of the Christ in Matthew's Gospel 91

CHAPTER VII

An Artist's Portrait of the Historical Jesus 104

CHAPTER VIII

Fragments of Christology in the Early Church 123

CHAPTER IX

The Christology of Paul 137

CHAPTER X

The Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews 160

CHAPTER XI

The Christology of the Apocalypse 174

CHAPTER XII

The Christology of John 185

CHAPTER XIII

Concluding Observations 202

Abbreviations 213

THE EVOLUTION OF NEW TESTAMENT CHRISTOLOGY

THE EVOLUTION OF NEW TESTAMENT CHRISTOLOGY

CHAPTER I

LITERARY SOURCES

In order to trace the development of Christology in the New Testament, we must settle some questions as to the literary sources. At least two questions demand an answer: (1) What are the authentic literary sources for a particular writer or writing? (2) What are the dates of the books recording the various Christologies of the New Testament? It would be utterly impossible to trace the growth of the christological conceptions found in the New Testament unless we have a scheme of dates for the New Testament books. In this chapter may be found our answer to the above questions.

1. *The Synoptic Gospels As Trustworthy Documents.* These are placed first, not because, in our opinion, they were written prior to the Pauline epistles, but because they record the earliest christological conceptions held by early Christians. The Christ of Mark and the Christ of the Logia must be our starting point for tracing the evolution of the early christological conceptions.

(1) *Mark the Oldest Gospel.* After half a century of critical research into the literary problems involved in the study of the Synoptic Gospels, although it is not universally conceded, yet it is the consensus of opinion among expert students of the New Testament that Mark is the oldest gospel.[1] This view is adopted as our historio-critical basis for tracing the development of the New Testament Christology.

(2) *Origin of the Synoptic Gospels.* The theory that these Gospels were composed by using materials which had been handed down by oral tradition[2] is rejected by most literary critics in favor of the documentary hypothesis.[3]. According

to this view Mark and the Logia (or Q) constitute the chief sources for Matthew and Luke; but also a Perean document, or documents (called L by some, P by others), and an infancy document were used by Luke.[4] Among the notables in the field of New Testament criticism who have recently opposed the "two document" theory should be mentioned Spitta[5] and Heinrici[6], who present variations of the old oral and interdependence theories.

(3) *Sources of Mark.* The advocates of the documentary hypothesis are not agreed as to how far Mark, along with Matthew and Luke, may be classed as a composite gospel. Until recently most critics accepting the "two document" theory regarded Mark, in the main, as having but one source, the "preaching of Peter."[7] Today it is becoming a conviction of many literary critics that Mark has, at least, two sources, the preaching of Peter[8] and the Logia, or Q. Although Loisy[9] has very recently expressed doubt as to the relation of the Second Gospel to Peter, yet, most scholars feel that its first and most extensive source is the preaching of Peter[10], Menzies,[11] Stanton,[12] Burton,[13] Castor,[14] Moffatt,[15] and others, think Mark did not use Q. Bacon goes so far as to assert the use of Q (not necessarily the Logia) and an unknown source called X.[16] He thinks the Redactor (not necessarily Mark[17]) is a "radical Paulinist" who works over the materials from Peter, Q and X in the interest of Pauline Christianity in Rome.

(4) *Trustworthiness of Mark.* To the extreme liberals[18] only the "ur-Marcus", or the "older Mark", the groundwork of the Gospel, is entirely trustworthy. Of course, the materials from the Logia, or Q, an Apostolic document[19], are to be accepted as wholly trustworthy, unless the critic is convinced, as Wrede, J. Weiss, and Bacon seem to be, that a "Pauline" dogmatist so used the sources as to promote a later dogmatizing tendency.

But is Mark history, or theological fiction?[20] May modern Christians rest with assurance upon the reliability of Mark? Is Jesus what Mark calls Him, the Christ, the Teacher, the Son of man, the Son of God? Did He teach essentially what Mark says He taught concerning the Kingdom of God and the overthrow of Satan, concerning service and sacrifice as the universal law of life, concerning His own death as the sacrifice to ratify the covenant, and concerning the last things?

Most of the liberal critics think of Mark as the "historical Gospel." O. Holtzman[21] thinks "the trustworthiness of Mark's Gospel is not shaken by Wrede's arguments."[22] Wernle,[23] two years after Holtzmann's reply to Wrede, in his discussion of the sources of the life of Jesus, re-emphasized the historical value of Mark, although evidently undervaluing that of Matthew. Menzies,[24] at the opening battles against the historical value of Mark, although not using the word "miracle" in his book except to deny the presence of the supernatural, persistently maintains it is the "chronological" Gospel and as such is, in the main, "historical" in character. Blass,[25] although positing an "original Mark" back of "our Mark," emphasized its "historical character." Evan A. Muller[26] who leans strongly toward an "interpretation that is mythical-allegorical," yet maintains that "in the words of Jesus" (especially in Mk. and Q) "there is a trustworthy historical kernel." P.M.J. Lagrange,[27] who belongs to the same school of thought as Wrede, J. Weiss, Loisy, Wendling, et al., though admitting some "Paulinism" in it, declares it to be the "oldest gospel" and based upon Peter; thinks it not clear that he used the Logia.[28]

Of course, it goes without saying that the less liberal and the conservative critics maintain the complete trustworthiness of Mark, for instance: B. Weiss,[29] Zahn,[30] Karl Beth,[31], Thorburn,[32] Sanday,[33] Denney,[34] David Smith,[35] T. R. Glover,[36] F. H. Chase,[37] Gore,[38] Ed. Meyer,[39] P. Dausch,[40] Peake,[41] Moffat,[42] Allen,[43] Jülicher,[44], Haussleiter,[45] Stanton,[46] Burkitt,[47] Robertson,[48] Farmer,[49] including most of the recent commentators,[50] and writers of New Testament theology—Beyschlag, Holtzmann, Weinel, Feine, Weidner, Stevens, Adeney, Sheldon, et al.[51]

(5) *Trustworthiness of Matthew and Luke.* Above it was shown that most modern scholars regard Mark and Q the chief sources of Matthew and Luke. So, if Mark is a trustworthy "historical" Gospel, as most scholars concede, as shown in the last section, that portion of Matthew and Luke derived from Mark must also be a trustworthy "historical" record (unless the authors perverted the facts in the interest of dogma; too be discussed later).

But what must be said about the second source, Q? It is apostolic in origin, having been "written in Aramaic" by

Matthew,[52] and so is, for the greater part of its material, the record of a credible eye-and-ear-witness. As to the trustworthiness of the document, or documents, from which Luke takes his Perean accounts (those not from Q) there should be no doubt, since Luke, by most scholars recognized as a "historian of first rank,"[53] was convinced of the reliabilty of his sources.

On the other hand, the first two chapters of Matthew and Luke have recently been subjected to the storm-blasts of radical criticism. Not only the extreme radicals[54] who deny the historicity of Jesus and the extreme liberals[55] who regard him as a mere man, the son of Joseph and Mary, but a few scholars, who feel that the remaining chapters of Matthew and Luke are trustworthy, yet question the historical character of the accounts of the virgin birth. In this group of serious scholars who doubt the historicity of the virgin birth may be mentioned H. J. Holtzman,[56] O. Holtzmann,[57] Harnack,[58] Meyer,[59] Weiss,[60] Bacon,[61] Kent,[62] J. M. Thompson,[63] and more recently Geo. A. Barton[64] and Berguer.[65] This last list is undoubtedly growing. But modern scholars of recognized ability in research, as Orr,[66] Box, [67] Ramsay,[68] Grutzmacher,[69] Carre,[70] (with reserve) Clemen,[71] (with reserve), Vincent Taylor,[72] A. T. Robertson,[73] Carpenter,[74] and others[75] champion the historical character of the records of the virgin birth. The arguments for the credibility of these early chapters in Matthew and Luke are: (1) Their unquestionable place in the oldest MSS, Sinaitic, Vatican, etc. (2) The evident independence of the two accounts, Matthew's and Luke's, which fact gives two literary witnesses for the virgin birth of Jesus. (3) The unmistakable references of Paul[76] and John[77] to the incarnation, which if not directly teaching the virgin birth, do not contradict it. (4) The scientific fact of parthenogenesis, or virgin birth, in the lower forms of animal life.[78] (5) The sinlessness of Jesus.[79]

But, passing over the question of the first two chapters of Matthew and Luke and the issue as to the trustworthiness of the source-documents (Mk., Q, and P), are the authors of the First and Third Gospels honest, competent historians? Are they dominated by "Pauline theology" and "ecclesiastical tendencies," as claimed by some critics,[80] or do they give us a true portrait (minus the personal element even in honest men

who try to report facts and the truth) of the historical Jesus? Surely Luke, recognized, as he is by so many competent critics,[81] to be the author of the Third Gospel, although a companion of the Apostle for over a score of years and necessarily influenced by his attractive personality and cosmopolitan gospel, cannot be accused of wilfully or unconsciously perverting the facts of his sources. As Burkitt[82] says: "Verse after verse, saying after saying, might be quoted from the Synoptic Gospels and, unless you happened to have a special knowledge or had given special attention to such matters, you would be unable to say to which gospel they really belonged." Probably Paul's personality and gospel influenced the writers of the three Synoptics; not however, to the extent of perversion of facts or teachings, but especially as to their selection of just those facts and teachings that had deeply influenced them (particularly so of Luke, less of Mark, and slightly so of Matthew) and also as to a slight coloring in the expression of these facts and teachings as found in our Synoptics. A vast array of scholars hold a view, in all essentials, practically in accord with this conclusion, and so rely upon Matthew and Luke, as well as Mark, as trustworthy records.[83]

The dating of the Synoptics by recent critics tends to establish the trustworthiness of Matthew and Luke. The tendency is toward the early dating of these documents. Harnack at first[84] dated Mark 65-85 (likely 65-70), Matthew 70-75, Luke 78-93, but more recently[85] he places Mark and Luke "before 63," and Mathew not later than 70. Other German critics are pushing the date of the Synoptics back of the year 70.[86]

So we may summarize as to the trustworthiness of the Synoptic records: (1) Mark's basal source is Peter's preaching—so recognized by extreme and moderate liberals and by all conservatives. (2) Even if Q, or the Logia, be a source of Mark, it is apostolic in origin and so a trustworthy document. (3) There is no general conviction among the critics that Mark used other "unknown" sources, or "worked over," in the interest of "dogma," the sources at his command. While a slight "Pauline" influence may be predicated, it is fairly certain that the Petrine preaching and the first hand facts from Peter (and possibly from Q) exerted a far greater influence on Mark. (4) So we may conclude: Mark is a historical Gospel, with practically no "dogmatizing" tendencies

by a "Redactor." (5) Therefore, Matthew and Luke, in so far as they reflect their historical sources, Mk and Q (or Logia) are to be accepted as trustworthy documents. (6) The other documents used by Luke,[87] for the first two chapters, for the Perean parables ,the accounts of Jesus' death and resurrection, must be accepted as on a par with the "two chief sources," since a careful, competent historian was "convinced" of their trustworthiness.[88] (7) As to Matthew, if some "ecclesiasticizing" tendencies should be found, they do not at all affect the Christology found in Mark and the Logia, nor materially that in Matthew.

2. *The Documents for the Christology of the Early Church.* (1) *Acts 1-12; 15.* These chapters purport to record the beliefs and practices of the early church in Jerusalem. Are they history, or "dogmatizing" fiction? What are the sources of these narratives and addresses? Was the author a careful, competent historian, or a Pauline apologist? Although many of the ablest modern scholars deny the Lucan authorship,[89] all conservative and many liberal critics accept it.[90]

Did the author have access to trustworthy sources of the facts? The experts are not agreed as to the nature of the sources back of the Acts[91] (1-12), some, as Harnack and Robertson especially, positing "tradition" as well nigh the exclusive source,[92] while others, especially Wendt,[93] Ramsay, B. Weiss, Williams,[94] Feine,[95] C. C. Torrey,[96], predicate documentary sources. However Luke may have received his data for the early chapters, whether from personal interviews with James and others in Jerusalem, with Philip and his daughters in Caesarea,[97] or from Aramaic documents, we may be sure, as claimed by most scholars, especially by Clemen,[98] Hobart,[99] Hückelheim[100] (who calls Luke "an unerring historian"), Harnack,[101] Ramsay[102] (who calls Luke "a historian of first rank"), Carpenter,[103] and A. T. Robertson,[104] that Luke the cultured, competent historian carefully sifted his sources and after being convinced of what is fact and what is truth faithfully recorded it.

(2) *The Epistle of James.* Although this epistle is held to be of late date by many critics,[105] yet by many of the ablest scholars it is held to be from the pen of James, the brother of the Lord, and so of early date.[106] Because of the simple Christology, and the primitive character of the christianity

reflected in the epistle of James we place it in our documents for the christological beliefs of the early church.

(3) *The First Epistle of Peter.* Although there is a strong tendency among critics to regard this epistle as post-Pauline,[107] a large number of critics in the last two generations, and many of the ablest today, still champion, or think probable, the Petrine authorship.[108] As claimed by the former group, the epistle unmistakably reflects the influence of Paul, but it is probable that the personal influence of Paul upon the Apostle Peter, (especially in the last fifteen years of their life) was equally as great as the Pauline influence reflected in the epistle itself.[109] As claimed by the latter group, the epistle reflects a soteriology and a christology more simple and more primitive than the Pauline,[110] but more advanced than the simple teachings of Acts 1-12 and the Epistle of James. So the Christology of First Peter forms the connecting link between the Christology of the early church and that of the Apostle Paul.

3. *The Pauline Literary Sources.* There are seven of the so-called Pauline Epistles which are now generally acknowledged to be authentic—I Thessalonians, Galatians, I and II Corinthians, Romans, Phillippians, and Colossians.[111] Ephesians is included by most of those mentioned in last footnote, but rejected by some of our ablest critics.[112] But the seven (practically) undisputed epistles furnish us an opportunity to study the development of the Pauline Christology. The epistle to the Thessalonians belongs to the earliest period of the Apostle's publications, the four great epistles, written a few years later, contain the core of his Christology, while the letters to the Philippians and the Colossians show the Apostle at the climax of his christological development.[113]

4. *The Epistle to the Hebrews.* Whoever wrote this masterpiece of christological thought and literary expression,[114] it is clear that he is chiefly indebted to four sources, Paulinism and primitive christianity, the Old Testament and the Alexandrian philosophy. Weiss,[115] Dods,[116] Stevens,[117] Bruce,[118] and Milligan,[119] minimize the Pauline influence; E. F. Scott[120] thinks there are only a few "echoes" of Paul and that these are only "seldom" discernible, while Pfleiderer,[121] Ménégoz,[122] Holtzmann,[123] W. Robertson Smith,[124] von Soden,[125] Nikel,[126] and Sheldon,[127] though utterly rejecting the Pauline authorship, magnify Paulinism as one of the mighty moulding forces

of the christology and soteriology of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Few are convinced that Professor Scott,[128] as to Christology, which is the heart of the epistle, really proved that "Hebrews stands closer to the Apostles than it does to Paul."[129] In some respects the Christology of Hebrews is an advance upon that of Paul and makes an easy transition from the Pauline to the Johannine Christology.

5 *The Apocalypse.* The Christology of the book is not affected by the extreme critical view that it is a "compilation" by a late "editor" who used one, two, or three Jewish (and possibly Christian) apocalypses, adopting the name "John" pseudonymously;[130] or whether it be composed by "an unknown prophet of Asia,"[131] or by John Mark,[132] or by John the Elder,[133] or by John the Apostle.[134] The later date of the Apocalypse is almost generally adopted by the later critics,[135] and so, there being only a brief interval between the dates, there should be no marked difference in the stage of development in the Christology of the Apocalypse and of the Johannine Gospel and Epistle. Indeed, the Christology of the Apocalypse is of the same lofty character as that found in the Gospel of John, and, if the linguistic arguments were not against the conclusion, the Christology of the two books would lead to the conclusion that one author wrote both.[136] As Charles says,[137] the Christology of the Apocalypse "is very comprehensive." However, it is not difficult to determine which is the higher development, the Christology of the Apocalypse or the Christology of the Johannine Gospel. Yet, the two form a fitting climax to the evolution of the New Testament conception of Christ.

6. *The Gospel and Epistle of John.* On whatever literary hypothesis we proceed, the Christology of John forms the climax of the New Testament Christology. This conclusion need not be changed whether we accept[138] or reject[139] the apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel; whether we defend[140] or deny[141] the apostolic authorship of the First Epistle.[142] It is certain that in these two documents the New Testament Christology has reached its highest stage of development.[143]

NOTES TO CHAPTER I

1. As early as the 4th cy. Augustine held Mt. to be the oldest Gospel, and "Mk. the copyist and abbreviator of Mt." This view was championed by Griesbach; more recently by Lightfoot, Bib. Essays; Zahn, Einl. (tr. 1917) —Mk. depends on Aramaic Mt.; Kolmodin, Inledning till Nya. Testaments Skrifter, 1915 (approx. Zahn's view); Veldkuizen, Van Het Evangelie van Markus, 1914; Leeuwen, Het Evangelie Van Mattheus, '15, ditto; very recently by H. G. Jameson, The Origin of the Synoptic Gospels, 1923.

2. As held by Westcott, Intro. to the Four Gospels, 1902; formerly championed by Wright, The Composition of the Four Gospels, 1890 (later, A Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek, 1903); also by Gieseler and Godet (Intro. etc.)

3. The interdependence theory that either Mt. or Mk. wrote first and the others used the existing gospel or gospels, held by Griesbach, Lightfoot, Zahn, Kolmodin, Veldkuizen, H. G. Jameson (above) has been almost wholly abandoned.

4. So, with differences as to details, Holtzmann, Die Synoptiker, 1901; Pfleiderer, Christian Origins, 1906; Wellhausen, Einl. in drei Evangelien, 1905 ("ur. Mc." in Aramaic which was a source of Q as of Mt. and Lk. who used Q also); Harnack, Lukas der Arzt, 1906, Sprüche u. Reden, 1907 (The Sayings of Jesus, 1909), also his Neue Untersuch. zur Apostelgeschichte u. zur Syn. Ev., 1911; Wernle, Die Quellen d. Lebens Jesu, 1904, S. 5, 19f. 25, 63f; Weiss, B., Die Quellen d. Syn. Ueberlieferung, 1908, kap. I-IV (Mk. and Q and spec. so in Lk.); Burton, Short Intro. to the Gospels, 1904, Some Principles of Lit. Crit. and Appli. to Syn. Prob., 1904, Some Phases of Syn. Prob., address in Jour. Bib. Lit. XXXI, 95 ff (Mt. and Lk. use our Mk. or "A document in large pt. ident. with it," and other common sources, and minor differing sources); Burkitt, The Gospel History in its Transmission, 1906; Stanton, The Gospels as Historical Documents, 1909, Vol. VI.; Sharman, The Teaching of Jesus about the Fut. acc. to Syn. Goss., 1909, also his Sources of Gos. Story; Holdsworth, Gos. Origins, 1913; Studies in Syn. Prob. by Oxford fac. membs., Hawkins, Streeter, Sanday, et al., 1911; Nicolardot, Les Procedes de Redaction de trois prem. Evangelistes, 1908; (placed here with some hesitancy); Schaefer-Meinertz, Einl. in d. N. T. 2 Aufl., 1913; Feine, Einl. in d. N. T. 1913; Allen and Grensted, Intro. to Bks. of N. T., 1913; Jülicher, Einl. 1906, Nuen Linien in d. Kritik d. ev. Überlieferung, 1906; Peake, A. Crit. Intro. to N. T., 1910; Moffatt, Intro. to Lit. of N. T., 1911 (new ed. 1923); most authors of N. T. Theol., Beyschlag, Holtzmann, Bovon, Weidner, Weinel, Feine, Gould, Adeney, Stevens, Sheldon, et al.

5. Streitfrage d. Geschichte Jesu, 1907—rejects Q, posits G, an "older Mark," the foundation (groundwork) of the Synoptics; Mt. on G., Lk. on Mt. and Mk.

6. Der lit. Charakter d. N. T. Schriften, 1908, S. 38, 39, 43, "each gos. recorded what is the common possesion of believers, reported by eye-witnesses and taught by traveling teachers."

7. According to statements by Papias and Irenaeus in H. E. III. 39, V. 8, 2-4: "Mk. having become the interpreter of Peter wrote down accurately everything that he remembered . . . he made it his one care not to omit anything that he had heard, or to set down any false statements therein." (Quoted by Peake, Intro. 119 f. from Lightfoot's trans.)

8. Cf. Schmiedel, art. Jesus, En. Bib., for an "Ur-Markus" (original Mk.) back of our Mk.; also Wrede, Das Messiasgeheimnis in d. Evangelien, 1901— "orig. Mk." gives "the real hist. of Jesus," the later Mk. writes from the "standpoint of the risen Messiah and designated Christ," "belongs to hist. of dogma"; also Hoffman, R. A., Das Marcus ev. u. Seine Quellen, 1904, S. 13 ff. 176, 180, Ara. orig. of Mk. in two forms; older, shorter for Jews, later, expanded, form for Gentiles.

9. L'Evangile selon Marc, 1922.

10. Even J. Weiss, Das Aelteste Ev., 1903, Christus, 1909; Bacon, Beginnings of Gos. Story, 1909, Is Mk. a Roman Gos.? 1919, art. Purpose of Mk., Jour. Bib. Lit. XXIX; 141-160, admit this source as important, though the latter emphasizes "Paulinism."

11. The Earliest Gospel, 1902.

12. Ibid above. 13. Ibid above. 14. Ibid. 15. Ibid, 204 f.

16. Cf. esp. Beginnings of Gospel Story, Intro. Also B. Weiss, ibid., Sanday, Streeter (Oxford Studies) and Allen (Mt. in ICC) think Mk. used Q.

17. Cf. Jesus and Paul, pp. 137 ff.; 183f.

18. As Schmiedel, Wrede, J. Weiss, Wendling, Bacon, et al.

19. Referred to as by Mt. in H. E. III. 39.

20. Wendling, E., Ur-Marcus, 1905, sees "three hands" in Mk: (1) M1, essentially "historical groundwork"; (2) M2, "a poetic expansion of M1"; (3), M3 Redactor who "dogmatizes" by calling Jesus Son of Man, Messiah, Son of God. Cf. later his Die Entstehung d. Mc—ev., 1908; also P. Carus, The Fulness, 1909, p. 142, Mk. from a "proto-Mk, Logia, and other documents." A. Thoma, Jesus u. die Apostel, 1910—Mk from an "Ur-Markus."

21. Das Messiasbewusstsein Jesu u. Neueste Bestreitung, 1902.

22. Cf. his work and views in f. n. under Sources of Mark.

23. ibid.

24. ibid. denies that Mk. "used" or even "knew" the Logia.

25. Die Entstehung u. d. Charakter unserer Evangelien, 1907.

26. Geschichtskern in d. Evangelien, 1905.

27. Evangile selon Saint Mark, 1911.

28. On the other hand, cf. Piepenbring, Jesus Historique, 1909, pp. 15-71, who thinks "Mk is strongly influenced by the Pauline theology." Even Q is influenced by Paul. Cf. also Robert Scott, The Epistles of Paul, 1909, for over-emphasis of Paul upon Mk. Also Roy Wood Sellars, The Next Step in Religion, 1918, pp, 82-

84, for undue emphasis of Paul's influence on Palestinian Christianity.

29. Ibid.; also Intro; Bib. Th. 30. Einl. tr. 1917.
31. The Miracles of Jesus, 1907.
32. The Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels, 1916.
33. The Life of Christ in Research, 1907.
34. Jesus and the Gospel, 1909. 35. The Days of His Flesh, 1910.
36. The Jesus of History, 1917.
37. The Gospels in the Light of Historical Criticism, 1914.
38. Belief in God, chs. 8 and 11; cf. also, Belief in Christ, 1923.
39. Ursprung u. Anfänge d. Christentums, S. 51 f. 179 ff.
40. Die Wunder Jesu, 1912, emph. "historicity of the gospels (esp. Mk.) in spite of miracles."
41. Ibid. 42. Ibid. 43. In Allen and Grensted, Intro. to Bks. of N. T., 1913.
44. ibid. 45. Die vier Evangelien, 1906. 46. ibid. 47. ibid; also art. The Historical Char. of the Gos. of Mk., in AJ Th. 11.2, pp. 169-193.
48. Studies in Mark's Gospel, 1919.
49. Art. Mk. Gos. of, Int. St. Bib. Enc., who dates it "in the fifties."
50. As Bruce in EGT, Gould in ICC, Swete, The Gos. Acc. to Mk., et al.
51. Cf. bibliography above under origin of Syn. Gospels.
52. Cf. H. E. III. 39; Peake, ibid. p. 122f.; Harnack, Sayings of Jesus, 1908, p. 249; in his date of the Acts and Synoptic Gospels, p. 125, he dates it "50 or even earlier"; von Soden, History of Early Christian Literature, p. 166 says: "The fact that it was possible to work those two chief sources together into one consistent whole is a fresh proof of the trustworthiness of these original documents in all essential points."
53. So Ramsay, Bearing of Recent Discovery, etc., pp. 200f; cf. also Harnack, Luke The Physician, 1907; Bruce EGT; Robertson, Luke the Historian, esp. chas. IV. and V.
54. As Jensen, Parallels of N. T. from Babylonian Epic (on Das Gilgamesch-epos, etc., esp. pp. 811-1030); Drews, Christus-Mythe, 1909, 1910, tr. The Christ Myth, 1911; J. M. Robertson, Christianity and Mythology, 1900; Pagan Christs, 1903; W. B. Smith, The Pre-Christian Jesus, 1906, 1911; Ecce Deus, 1911; Dujardin, The Source of the Christian Tradition, 1913; also Lublinski, Steudel, Kalthoff, et al. For a sketch of these men's views and reply to them cf. Garvie, Handbook of Christian Apologetics, pp. 83 ff; Clemen, Der geschichtliche Jesus, s. 16-43; Case, The Historical Jesus, ch. II.
55 As Schmiedel, Jesus, En. Bib. col. 2955; Neumann, Jesus, tr. Canney, '06, pupil of Schmiedel; Bousset, Jesus, 1906; Wellhausen Das Ev-Mt., '04, Das Ev-Lc.; '04 (omits chs. I and II without explanation); Lobstein, The Virgin Birth of Christ, '05; Chas. Van Norden, Jesus. An Unfinished Portrait ("only a man" but admits this hypoth. does not explain "all" the facts);

Wrede, Das Messiasgeheimnis in d. Evangelien, '01 (Jesus felt no messianic consciousness); Edmunds, The Buddhistic and Christian Gospels, '06 (title "Lord" even in Lk. from "Buddhistic Epic"); Gilbert, Jesus, '12 (V. B. accts. called "legends"); Roy W. Sellars, The Next Step in Religion, '18, esp. p. 64, endorses Strauss' view of "rel. Lit." as "myths and dogmas"; p. 94, asserts, "I am certain that the deification of Jesus will be given up step by step. He was not born miraculously, etc."; Bundy, The Psychic Health of Jesus, '22, (in the main, fol. Wrede); cf. Soltau, The Virgin Birth, p. 65, who thinks it the "sin against the Holy Spirit to demand one to believe in the virgin birth" (from stories of birth of Augustus and other pagan kings); also Gressmann, Das Weinachs—Evang. u. Ursprung u. Geschichte untersucht, '14 (possibly these accts. are "from Osiris legends)."

56. Das Messianische Bewusstsein Jesu, 1901.

57. Leben Jesu, '01; even stronger doubt in his Christus, 2 Aufl. '14, whom Dibellius, Th. Lit. Zeit, '16, Nr. 11, c. 244, pronounces "as one-sided as Wernle."

58. Date of Acts and Syn. Gospels, pp. 145, 148, thinks Lk. 1:35 an "interpolation."

59. Com. on Mt. 60. ibid. 61. Jesus and Paul, ch. VII.

62. Life and Teachings of Jesu, '13. 63. Miracles in the N. T. '12. 64. Jo. Bib. Lit. etc. Vol. XLIII. ('24) pp. 213 ff. who thinks Apollos, influenced by Philo, is possibly the author of Lk. I and II.

65. Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus, '23.

66. The Virgin Birth, pp. 84 ff.

67. The Virgin Birth of Jesus, 1916.

68. Was Christ Born at Bethlehem? 73-80; Bearing of Recent Discovery, etc. p. 222 ff.; Luke the Physician, p. 13.

69. The Virgin Birth, '08, emph. superiority of accts. in Mt. 1 and 2, in Lk. 1 and 2, over the pagan "legends."

70. Miracles in the New Testament.

71. Die Buddhistische Einflüesse in d. N. T., art. Zu N. Test. Th. '16. 2, 128-138; also his Primitive Christianity and Non-Jewish Sources.

72. The Virgin Birth, 1920.

73. Luke The Historian, 1920.

74. Christianity According to S. Luke.

75. As Plummer, ICC; Bruce, EGT, et al.

76. Gal. 4:4; Rom. 1:3; 8:3.

77. Jno. 1:14; I Jno. 1:1-3.

78. Cf. art. Parthenogenesis in New Internat. Encycl.; cf. Robertson, Luke the Hist. 113 f. For my part the fact of parthenogenesis in the lower forms of life is not convincing as to the fact of Jesus' virgin birth; however, it is an analogy, and so has collateral weight.

79. Bruce, Apologetics, 408 ff.; Orr, ibid. p. 191; Robertson, ibid. p. 117.

80. Pfleiderer, Early Christian Conception of Christ, '05, pp. 10 ff; Bacon, ibid.; J. Weiss, ibid.; Wrede, ibid.; Robert Scott.

ibid; and others mentioned above under Trustworthiness of Mk.

81. From Marcion on to B. Weiss, Ramsay, Hobart, Harnack, Plummer, A. T. Robertson, et al.

82. The Gospel Hist. and its Transmission, p. 216.

83. As Jülicher, Wendt, Lehre Jesu, I. 7-49, Heinrici, Harnack, Wernle, Jesus, '16, Feine, Ed. Meyer, Belser, Einl., Bruce, EGT, Burkitt, Stanton, Sanday, Hawkins, Bartlet (Oxford Studies) Garvie, St. Lk. with Intro. and Notes, '11, Ragg, Com. on Lk.; Plummer, ICC., Carpenter, A. T. Robertson, Burton, et al. Cf. bib. above. So also more recently B. S. Easton, The Gospel According to St. Luke; A Critical and Exegetical Com., 1926; not so clearly J. H. T. Fowler, The History and Literature of the New Testament, 1925.

84. Die Chron. d. altchr. Lit. 653 ff.

85. Date of Acts and the Syn. Goss. '11.

86. So Feine, Einl. in d. N. T., '13; Schaefer-Meinertz, Einl. in d. N. T., '13, et al. For those who preceded Harnack in pushing back the date of Syns. cf. Zahn, Intro. '17; on Einl. in d. N. T. 1897, 1900; Haussleiter, Die vier Evv. '07; Peake, ibid; Moffatt, ibid. esp. his Hist. N. T. pp. 14-16. Cf. Farmer, ibid, who dates Mk. "in the fifties."

87. Cf. 1:1-4. 88. Cf. 1:3— "having traced the course of all things accurately from the first, etc."

89. Baur, Paulus, d. Apostel, 2 Aufl. 1873-5; De Wette, Comm. 1848; Zeller, Apostelgeschicte, 1854; Hilgenfeld, Apostelgeschichte, 1899; Holtzmann, H. J., N. T. Th., 1897; Overbeck, Comm. revision of De Wette, 1870; Hausrath, Neut. Zeitgeschichte, 1875; Weisäcker, D. Apos. Zeitalt., 1886; Wendt, Apostelgeschichte, 2 Aufl. 1913; Schürer, Geschichte d. Jud. Volks, 1885; Pfleiderer, Das Urchristentum, 2 Aufl. 1902; von Soden, History of early Christian Literature, on Ur. Literaturgeschichte; Spitta, Apostelgeschichte, 1891; Jülicher, Einl. in N. T., 1906; J. Weiss, Uber d. Absicht u. d. Lit. Character d. Apostelgeschichte, 1897; C. Clemen, Die Apostelgeschichte, etc. 1905, Die Chronologie d. Paul. Briefe, 1893; McGiffert, A Hist. of Chr. in the Apos. Age; Knopf, Das N. T. Apostelgeschichte, hsg. von J. Weiss, 1909; also art. Th. Lit. Zeit. '16. Nr. 9, col. 198; Preuschen, Apostelgeschichte, 1912; Bacon, Jesus and Paul, p. 63; also Intro. to N. T.; Cadbury, The Making of Luke-Acts, '27.

90. Credner, Einl, 1836; B. Weiss, Intro. I 314-354, Bib. Th. 1. 159 ff.; Renan, Les Apotres; Hobart, Med. Lang. of St. Lk., 1882; Hackett, Acts in Am. Com. 1864; Ramsay, St. Paul the Trav., Ch. in Rom. Emp., Bearing of Recent Discovery, Pauline and other Studies, esp. cf. Luke the Phys. '08, pp. 1-68; Sir Jno. Hawkins, Horae Synopticae, 1899; Blass, Acta Apostolorum, etc. 1895; also Prof. Harnack u. die Schriften d. Lukas, '07; Plummer, Lk. in ICC.; Harnack, Lukas d. Arzt, 1906, Apostelgeschichte 1908; Ropes, Apos. Age, 1908; Burkitt, Gos. History in its Transmission; Moffatt, Hist. N. T., Intro. to Lit. of N. T., 1923; Conyheare and Howson, Life and Epis. of St. Paul; Chase, Credibility of Acts, 1902; Rackham, Comm. 1909, new ed. '22; Know-

ling, EGT; 1901; Peake, A Crit. Intro. 1910; Homan, Luke the Greek Physician, p. 12; Hayes, I. The Syn. Goss. and Acts; Robertson, A. T. Art., Acts. in Int. Stan. Bib. Enc., Luke the Historian, 1920; Kolmodin, ibid. under Syn. Goss. pp. 543-563; Koch, H., Die Abfassungsseit d. Luk. Geschichtswerks, 1911; Huckelheim, Zweck d. Apostelgeschichte, 1908; Belser, Einl. 1901; Zahn. Apostelgeschichte, 1919, his Einl. tr. '17; Jones, Maurice, The N. T. in Twentieth Century, 1914; Blunt, A. W. F., The Acts of Apostles, 1922; Hill, Apos. Age, 1922; Heinrici, Die lit. Char. d. N. T. Schriften, 1908.

91. Cf. Moffat, Intro. to Lit. of N. T. 286-9, for sketch of theories by Blass, Briggs, Clemen, Harnack, Jungs, Sorof, Spitta, B. Weiss, et al; Robertson, Luke the Historian, pp. 86 ff., Cf. Williams, Participle in Bk. of Acts, ch. 12.

92. Cf. Robertson, ibid, p. 84 ff.; Harnack, Acts of Apos. p. 163.

93. Apostelgeschichte, 1899. 94. The Participle in the Book of Acts, 1909. 95. Einl. in d. N. T. 1913.

96. Cf. Torrey, Studies in Hist. of Rels. etc., 1912, pp. 269 ff.; later his The Composition and date of Acts, 1916.

97. Cf. Ac. 21:8 f. 15 f. "We" in Caesarea and Jerusalem.

98. ibid. above, S. 37, though not for Lucan authorship, emph. the "historical char." of Acts. 99. ibid. 100. ibid. s. 85.

101. Ac. of Apos. p. 163 f. but he puts Ac. 1-12 on a lower historical basis than 13-28.

102. Esp. Bearing of Rec. Discov. pp. 200-205.

103. Christianity Acc. to S. Luke, pp. 21-25.

104. ibid. Ch. VI.

105. Baur, Paul the Apos.; Pfleiderer, Urchr. IV. 293 f; Brückner, Chron. 60f.; Zeller, Apostelgeschichte, 1854; Hausrath, ibid; Davidson, Intro.: von Soden, ibid.; Jülicher, ibid; Holtzmann, N. T. Th.; Schmidt. Proph. of Naz. p. 196; Harnack, Die Chron. alt. chr. Lit. p. 486; McGiffert. Apos. Age; Bacon, Intro. to N. T.; Peake, ibid. 84 ff.; Moffat, ibid p. 472; Sheldon, N. T. Th. pp. 125 ff.; Ropes, The Epistle of James, 1916.

106. So Neander, Planting and Training, 1887; Beyschlag, N. T. Th. I. 300ff., B. Weiss, Bib. Th. I. 168ff, Intro.; also his Der Jacobusbrief, 1904; Zahn, Einl. I. 73ff.; Renan, Les Apostres; Hort, Jud. Chr. p. 147 ff; Alford, Comm.; Farrar, Messages of the Bks.; Early Christianity; Moulton, J. H., Gram. Vol. I. Proleg. p. 11; Plummer, The Gen. Ep. of Jas. (Exp. Bib.) 1891; Dods, Intro. to N. T.; Pullan, Bks. of N. T., 1901; Patrick, James the Bro. of the Lord, 1906; Mayor, The Epis. of St. James, 1910, art, Jas. Epis. of, HDB.; Oesterley, Jas. in EGT, 1901; Stevens, N. T. Th., p. 250; Robertson. Prac. and Soc. Aspects of Chr. 1915, G. H. Rendall, The Eps. of Jas. and Jude, '27, and many others.

107. So von Soden, Early Chr. Lit. '06. pp. 278 ff.; also Handkom.; Harnack, Chron. p. 454 (afterwards inclines toward Petrine authorship; cf. Peake, ibid. p. 94); Hilgenfeld, Einl; Jülicher, Pfleiderer, Urc., 2 Aufl. 1902; Hausrath, Neut. Zeitalt.; Zeller, Apostelgeschichte; S. Davidson, Intro.; Schmiedel, art, Peter, Ep. of, En. Bib.; McGiffert, Apos. Age; Sheldon, N. T.

Th.; Ora Delmar Foster, Lit. Relations of the First Epis. of Peter, etc.; Bacon, Intro.; Schaefer-Meinertz, Einl. 1913, Pt. II; Feine, Einl, 1913 (last two fol. von Soden in favor of Sylvanus); Völter, D. erste Petrusbrief, 1906; Soltau, Stud. u. Krit. '05. 302 ff., '06. 456 ff.; Holtzmann, N. T. Th.

108. So Neander, Pl. and Tr.; B. Weiss, Paulus u. d. Gemeinden, '14, s. 60; also N. T. Th. and Intro.; Zahn, Einl. (cf. tr. II. 134 ff.); Bleek, Einl; Renan, Les Apotres; Brückner, Hand-Kom.; Weiseler, Kom.; De Wette, Einl. and Kom.; Huther, Com.; Ewald, art. Das Prob. d. ersten Petrusbriefer, S. K. pp. 872 ff.; Usteri, Kom.; Sieffert, Hand-Kom.; Gloag, Intro. to N. T., Intro. to Cath. Eps.; Hort, Jud. Chr.; Farrar, Early Days of Chr.; Lightfoot, Clement II. 499; Plumptre, Com.; Sanday, Expos. June, 1893; Cook, Com.; Ropes, Apos. age; Chase, art. Peter, Eps. of HDB; Peake, ibid, p. 95 (with much reserve). Moffat, ibid; Moorehead, art. Peter, Ep. of, Int. St Bib. Enc.; Hart, EGT; Bigg. ICC; Grosch, Die Echtheit d. 2 Briefer Petri, untersucht, 2 Aufl., '11 (both eps. genu.); Schlatter, N. T. Th. II. S. 457 f.; (both genu.); Lambert, The Sacraments in N. T. '03, Lect. I; Edmundson, The Ch. in Rome in First Cent. '13; Jones, Maurice, The N. T. in Twentieth Cent. Pt. II. Ch. 6.

109. Cf. Hart. Intro. to Peter, First Ep., EGT.

110. Cf. Weiss, N. T. Th. I. 163 ff., who places it with his discussion of the early church; cf. Sheldon, N. T. Th. pp. 270 ff., who places it under "modified Paulinism."

111. So by all conservative, and practically all liberal, critics, e. g. writers of Intro. Eichhorn, Credner, De Wette, Bleek, Hilgenfeld, Jülicher, Weiss, S. Davidson, Salmon, Zahn, Belser, Feine, Godet, Jacquier, Peake, Moffatt, Bacon, Hayes; writers of N. T. Th., Baur, (only four great eps.) van Oosterzee, Schmid Reuss, Holtzmann, Immer, Beyschlag, Weiss, Weinel, Bovon, Weidner, Gould, Stevens, Adeney, Sheldon; historians of Apos. Age, Lechler, Hausrath, Harnack, Pfleiderer, J. Weiss, von Dobschütz, McGiffert, Ramsay, Ropes, W. B. Hill. All leading Coms., Camb. Bib., Cent. Bib., Expos. Bib., Expos. Grk. Test., ICC, etc. For extreme mutilation of these recognized eps. of Paul, cf. Robert Scott, The Epistles of Paul, 1909; Völters, Der Paulus u. Seine Briefe, 1905; for editorial influ. in Rom. cf. Spitta, Zur Geschichte u. Litt. d. Urc. 3 Band, I Hälfte, 1901, S. 4, 33, 63, f.

For discussions of Colossians which allow to Paul only a "ground-work" of short letter (half, or less than half, of canonical Col.) denying as Pauline the christological sections 1:15-20; 2:9f, cf. H. J. Holtzmann, Kritik der Epheser-u. Kolosserbriefe, etc., 1872; von Soden, Jahrbücher für Prot. Th. 1885, S. 320ff; 497ff; 672ff, (but in Holtzmann "Hnd-Com., Vol. III. Pt. I. Col. von Soden thinks 1:15-20, exc. 1:16b-17, Pauline; however, in his late work, Urchristliche Literaturgeschichte, '05, S. 51ff; tr. '05, reverts to former view); Hausrath, Neutest. Zeitgeschichte, 1875, II. S. 358, tr. IV. 118; Pfleiderer, Urc. '02, I. 190f; tr. I. 268 ff.; Hönig, Zeitschrift f. Wiss. Th. XV. 87f.; more recently, Bowen, The Orig. Form of Paul's Letter to the Col. Jo. Bib. Lit. XLIII,

Pts. I and II. 177ff. J. Weiss, as late as 1900, in Th. Lit. Zeit. Sept. 29, Col. 555, also asserts that "Holtzmann's interpolation hypoth. is not held as necessary by any of the recent expositors." Cf. Moffatt, ibid, p 156 f. for arguments pro and con on the genuineness of Col.

112. As Schleiermacher, Einl. 165; Renan, III. XII. f.; Brückner, Chron. 257 f.; S. Davidson, Intro. II. 261 ff.; von Soden, ibid, 284 f.; von Dobschutz, Urc. 175 f.; Clemen, Paulus, I. 138 f.; Wrede, Entstehung d. Schriften d. N. T., '07; A. Thoma, Jesu u. die Apostel, '10; Knopf, R., Paulus, '09; Pfleiderer, Urc. 2 Aufl., '02; Jülicher, ibid, Holtzmann, ibid, (last three uncertain); Harnack, Texte u. Untersuch, II. 2. S. 100, 1884, but later in his Die Addressee d. Eph. briefs d. P., '10, for the Pauline authorship; Rob. Scott, ibid, 180 ff.; Moffatt, ibid, 181ff.

113. Observe, 2 Thes., Eph., Philem., and the Pastorals would add scarcely anything to the Christology of Paul as found in the undisputed epistles.

114. Cf. Peake, ibid. ch. VIII; Moffatt, INT, 420-455; Com. on Heb. in ICC; Zahn, II. 341-366, for arguments pro and con, respecting the authorship by Paul, Barnabas, Apollos, Luke, Priscilla, et al.

115. Intro. II. 7 ff., D. Heb. brief, etc. 1904. 116. Intro. to Heb. E. G. T.

117. Th. of N. T. p. 488. 118. Art, Heb., Ep. to, HDB.

119. Theol. of Ep. to the Heb., Intro.

120. The Epistle to the Hebrews, pp. 49, 50, 60-62—"Heb. stands closer to the Apostles than it does to Paul."

121. Paulinism, II.3. 122. Theol. de l' Epitre Aux Heb. p. 190. 123. N. T. Th. II. 286. 124. Art. Heb. in En. Bib. (with von Soden). 125. Hand-Kom., Einl. p. 2, claims that the epistle shows a knowledge of, and "distinct allusions to, passages in Pauline epistles."

126. Der Hebräerbrief, 1914. 127. N. T. Th. pp. 270 ff— calls it "modified Paulinism"; "takes up most of the content of Pauline Christology."

128. Ibid. 49 f., 60-62.

129. Cf. Sheldon, p. 284, who says, "In describing the transcendence and glory of the pre-incarnate Son the Ep. to the Heb. vies with the later Eps. of Paul and reaches essentially to the level of the prologue of John's Gospel."

130. So, with variations, by Volkmar, Com.; S. Davidson, Intro.; Weizäcker, Apos. Zeitalt.; Wernle, Urchr. I. 363; Forbes, Int. Handbks. to N. T. II, 1907; Vischer, Offenb, John.; Schmiedel, Johan., Writings, pp. 208 ff.; Ménégoz, Wellhausen, Analyse d. Offenb. Joh. 1907; Gunkel, Schöpfung u. Chaos, 1895; J. Weiss, Offenb. d. Joh. 1904, S. 40, 81, 85, et al, Cf. also C. Clemen, art. The Revelation of John, Bib. World, Aug. 1908, who thinks it "from a former epic," but calls it in present form "a complete drama."

131. So Jülicher, Einl. sec. 22; Reville, Origines de l'Episco. I.; Charles, Rev. in ICC— "a pales. Jew who migrated to Asia

Minor and exercised authority over chs. of the Prov. of Asia."

132. So Hitzig, Über Joh. Mk. u. Seine Schriften, S. 67; Weisse, Ev. Frage, 91 f. 140, 180; Spitta, Offenbarung d. 1889; Völter, Offenbarung d. Joh.

133. So Eichhorn, Einl.; Bleek, Einl.; de Wette, Com.; Ewald, Com.; Credner, Einl.; Neander, Pl. and Tr.; Keim, Geschichte Jesu von Naz. 1867-72; Rom. u. d. Christentum, 1887; O. Holtzmann, Joh. Ev. 1887; Selwyn, The Christian Prophets and the Prophetic Apocalypse, 1900; Heinrici, Urchr. 1902, 126 f.; von Dobschütz, Prob. d. Apos. Zeitalt, '04; Harnack, Chron., art, Rev. in En. Brit. 9 ed.; Bousset, Offenb., Joh. 1906, p. 34 f. art. Apoc., En. Bib.; von Soden, Bks. of N. T. 1907; Loisy; Autor d'un petit livre, 1903; McGiffert, ibid; Pfleiderer, Urchr. 1902; Peake, ibid.; Moffatt, ibid.; Votaw, Bib. World, Nov. 1908—"hesitates to form judgment"; Burney, Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel, 1902.

134. Baur, N. T. Th. 1864; B. Weiss, Intro., Bib. Th.; Simcox, Com. in CGT; C. A. Scott, Camb. Bib.; Zahn, Einl; Battifol, Lecons sur les Evv. 106 f.; Stanton, GHD. I. 171 ff.; Lepin, L'Orig. du. quat. Ev. 257 ff.; Jacquier, Intro. IV. 321 ff.; E. A. Abbott, Diates. Pt. VII. 2942 ff.; Ramsay, Lets. to the Seven Chs., ch. VII; Beyschlag, N. T. Th. II. 347 ff; Belser, Einl. '01, 397 ff.; Abbe C. Fouard, Saint Jean et la Fin le l'Age Apostolique, chs. VI and VII; Stevens, Th. of N. T. 526; Swete, The Apoc. of St. John, 1907; Sheldon, N. T. Th. 130 ff.; Bacon, Intro. 1900, 237; Porter, HDB ("not impossible, only a guess"); Salmon, Intro. 233 f.; Maurice Jones, N. T. in Twentieth Cent., '14; Orr, J., Int. St. Bib. Enc. (with reserve.); Vedder, Johan. Writings, 1917; Hill, Apos. Age, 1923.

135. As Weisäcker, H. J. Holtzmann, Harnack, Jülicher, Bousset, Zahn, Reinach, Dods, Milligan, Sanday, Ramsay, McGiffert, Bacon, Porter, Votaw, Goodspeed, Swete, Moffatt, Hill, Charles, et al.

136. As held by all conservative and by many liberal critics, as Beyschlag, Weiss, Zahn, Stevens, Sheldon, Vedder, Belser, Fouard, Swete, Robertson, (A. T.), W. B. Hill, et al.

137. Rev. of St. Jno., ICC, p. CX.

138. So Bertholdt, Ebrard, Bleek, Norton, Ritschl., Hase, Orr, Sanday, Luthardt, H. H. Evans, Watkins, T. B. Strong, H. R. Reynolds, Strachan, Drummond, Lepin, Beyschlag, C. E. Scott-Moncrief (cf. Moffatt, Intro. 516, for titles) and recently, B. Weiss, Das Joh. Ev. '12; Zahn, ibid; Godet, L'Ev. de St. Jean, 1907-14; Meyer, Com.; Gloag, Intro.; Belser, Einl. '10, s. 236 f.; Salmon, Intro.; Stevens, N. T. Th.; Sheldon, N. T. Th.; Dods, EGT; Julicher, Einl. '06; Haussleiter, Die Vier Evv. 1907; Ed. Meyer, Ursprung, etc. I. 312 ff.; C. R. Gregory, Wellhausen u. Johannes, '10, 4ff. etc. ans. Wellhausen's hypoth. of a Redactor; Jacquier, Hist. d. libs. du N. T. vol. IV; Konrad Meyer, D. Zeugnis Zweck d. Ev. Joh. '06; S. Goebel, Reden Unseres Hern nach Joh. '06, Barth, Die Hauptprob. d. Lebens Jesu, 2 Aufl. '03; Guttjahn, Glaubwirdigkeit d. Irenaisch Zeug. etc. '04, s. 90 f., 119;

Bouillon, L'Eglise Apos. etc., '13-14; Monse, Johannes u. Paulus, '15; Kolomodin, ibid; Appel, Die Echtheit d. Ev. '15; Larfeld, Die Beiden Johannes von Eph. '14— "Papias held Apos. Jno. to be author"; Pullan, The Gospels, '12; Feine, Th. des N. T. '10, Einl. '13; Swete, Apoc.; Hayes, Jno. and His Writings, '16; Robertson, Divinty of Christ in Gos. of Jno. '16; Vedder, Johan. Writings, etc. '17; Durell, Self-Rev. of our Lord, 1911; H. Scott-Holland, The Fourth Gospel. '23; W. B. Hill, Apos. Age, '23, et al.

139. So Vögel, B. Bauer, Baur, Zeller, Hilgenfeld, Pfleiderer, Volkmar, Weisäcker, J. J. Taylor, S. Davidson, Shenkel, Martineau, O. Holtzmann, J. Reville, E. A. Abbott, (cf. Moffatt, 516 for titles), Schmiedel, D. Vierte Ev. '06; N. Schmidt, Proph. of Naz. 213; Wernle, Quellen d. Lebens Jesu, '14; Loisy, ibid, Wellhausen, Ev. John. '04; E. Schwartz, Göttingische Gelehrte Nachrichten; E. F. Scott, The Fourth Gos. '06; Bacon, The Fourth Gos. '10, 308 ff.; Moffatt, ibid.; H. L. Jackson, The Fourth Gospel and Some Recent German Criticism '06 (on fence); The Problem of the Fourth Gos., '18 (not on fence as in former book); Heitmüller in J. Weiss, Schriften d. N. T. '07; von Soden, Early Chr. Lit. '06; Thos. Wearing, World View of the Fourth Gos. '18; Burkitt, ibid.; von Dobschütz, ibid.; Burney, ibid, Garvie, Chr. Apol. 108 f., and The Beloved Disciple, '23.

140. Grimm, S. K. 1847, 171 f.; B. Weiss, Meyer, Com.; Jülicher, Einl. '16; Jacquier, ibid.; Lepin, ibid.; R. Law, Tests of Life, 339 ff; Beyschlag, II. 412 ff; Zahn, Einl. III; Stevens, ibid.; Sheldon, ibid.; Salmon, ibid.; Salmond, HDB, II.; Westcott, Com., Vedder, ibid.; Brooke, ICC; Smith, EGT; Hill, Ap. Age, et al. All just named accept a common apostolic authorship of Gospel and Epistles. The following are against a common authorship, but think that both are the products of "a common group or school in Asia Minor": S. P. Lange, Com.; Baur, Th. Jahrbuch; 1848, 293 ff.; Volkmar, Rel. Jesu; Strauss, Leben Jesu; Holtzmann, JPT, 1881, 690 f.; S. Davidson, ibid.; Mt. Arnold, ibid., 192; Schmiedel, En. Bib. 2556f.; Wellhausen, Soltau, Altchr. Litt.; E. F. Scott, ibid. 88 f.; Moffatt, ibid. 593 f.

141. So Baumgarten, S. N. T. '03; Harnack, Altchr. Litt.; Clemen, ZNW, '05; E. A. Abbott, En. Bib. 1878; Forbes, Internat. Hndbk. to N. T. '07; all of whom hold to a common authorship of Gospel and Epistles; for others denying the Apostolic authorship of I Jno. cf. Moffatt, Zahn, Brooke, ICC.

142. 2 and 3 Jno. are omitted because contributing nothing to the Johannine Christology.

143. Cf. Scott, The Fourth Gospel.

CHAPTER II

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MESSIANIC IDEA AND PERSON

In this chapter it is our aim to discover the historical source of the messianic idea, whether Hebrew, pagan, or general; then to trace the growth of the idea which, like a river, broadens as it flows down the centuries of Hebrew and Jewish history; to trace the literary sources in the Old Testament to determine how and in what respect the idea is developed; to trace the origin and development of the idea of a personal Messiah; to discover the functions of the Messiah and to delineate their order of development; and finally to discuss the doctrine of the person of the Messiah.

This historical survey is made in order to discover, if it exists, the historical connection between New Testament Christology and Old Testament and Apocalyptic Messianism; to show whether or not the New Testament Christology is constructed on the historical pillars of Messianism as found in the Old Testament and in later Jewish literature.

1. *The Origin of the Messianic Idea.* The messianic idea is much older than the idea of a personal Messiah. It is centuries after the birth of the messianic idea before we find clear expression of the hope for a personal Messiah. Emmet[1] thinks it is unfortunate for Christianity that the term messianic is used in this "looser" sense. "The oldest and the most general expectation is that of the era of happiness and with this the hope of the Messiah was sometimes combined in later times. For it is quite clear that a majority of O. T. passages which deal with the hopes of a glorious future do not specify the King of the future at all; Jehovah Himself is the agent of deliverance and of judgment; He alone is Saviour and Redeemer in the O T." That is, the messianic hope, in its "looser" sense, is the expectation of a future Golden Age for Israel as a nation.

According to Schürer,[2] the messianic hope is "the core of the

religious consciousness" of Israel. The commands and ordinances, they thought, were given them by Jehovah "for the purpose of providing them with much reward."[3] The religious consciousness was "concentrated upon the hope of the future." The primitive messianic hope included only Israel as the object of Jehovah's favor in the Golden Age. The nations would either be destroyed or forced to acknowledge the supremacy of Israel, while the chosen nation would be purified and fitted to reign and be happy in the future.

(1) *The Promise To Abraham The Historical Origin.* "I will make of thee a great nation—and in thee shall the families of the earth be blessed" (or bless themselves).[4] "Look now toward the heavens, and number the stars, if thou be able to number them; and He said unto him, So shall thy seed be."[5] Edersheim correctly says:[6] "The history of the Kingdom of God begins with that of Abraham." Briggs[7] however, in commenting on "the electing grace of God through the seed of Abraham," speaks of "the previous messianic ideas of a suffering and victorious human race and the advent of God to the tents of Shem." That is, Briggs traces the messianic idea back to the threat and promise of Jehovah to put "enmity between the serpent and the seed of the woman." So would Delitzsch,[8] Edersheim,[9] Dods[10] (with reserve), Schultz,[11] Oehler,[12] and most conservatives. Surely it may be said that the curse upon the serpent implies the deliverance of the seed of the woman.[13] But if we would be sure of placing our feet upon historical ground, we must defer to the limitations of the promise to Shem, and especially to Abraham.[14] In fact the real historical basis of the messianic hope is the deliverance of Israel from Egyptian bondage, carrying with it the assurance of inheritance in Canaan. "And I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you a God——and I will bring you in unto the land which I swear to give to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob."[15] "And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation."[16] As Crichton has well said,"[17] "On the ground of this promise the prophets, while declaring God's wrath against His people on account of their sins, looked beyond the Divine chastisement to the final era of perfect salvation and blessedness."

This promise is still further limited to Judah as the leader of Israel and the tribe from which the personal Messiah should

descend.[18] "Judah is a lion's whelp." "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah—until Shiloh come." However, the exact meaning of the promise to Judah is not known. A few of the older scholars followed Justin in making Shiloh mean the Messiah, but most modern scholars think it denotes the goal of Israel's destiny—the promised land. So Schultz,[19] Ewald,[20] Dillmann,[21] Briggs,[22] Dods,[23] Skinner,[24] and others. As Briggs with exactness says, "The fruits of victory are in a land of blessing—God dwells especially with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and their seed forever—These messianic promises of the patriarchs constitute the most precious inheritance, which they transmit to the tribes of Israel as the bearers of redemption to mankind." Again he says, "There is in this prophecy explicitly only the victorious Judah, the submissive nations, and the occupation of the promised land by the tribes of Israel"; but implicity there is also the lion of Judah, the praise of Israel" (a play on the meaning of the Hebrew word, Judah,)," the conqueror of the nations, the Messiah, who is to bring all these promises to their fruition." So also Dods and Skinner, but with considerable reserve; Dillman and Driver also concede the possibility of reference, in these promises, to the historical Messiah.[25]

(2) *Is the Source also Pagan or General?* Is the messianic hope as expressed in the Old Testament and later Jewish literature of exclusively Hebrew origin? Or, is it a part of the "Pan-Babylonian" inheritance handed down to the Hebrews as as an indivisible part of the Semitic race? Or, if not originally and in toto borrowed from non-Hebrew sources, is it modified in its development by foreign influences? Very few scholars are willing to go as far as Gunkel,[26] Gressman,[27] and Cheyne,[28] in asserting that the messianic hope of the ancient Hebrews was a common possession of the ancient world. This trio of Hebrew experts argue that in Egypt and Babylonia, especially in the latter, we find cherished the hope of a "semi-divine Deliverer or Heilbringer," and that "the Old Testament language is intelligible only when understood as one expression of that hope."[29] Gressman,[30] with peculiar emphasis, argues that the Messiah, in this large sense, is the primal man ("urmensch"), the herolord of Paradise who is to return with the Golden Age; that the idea of "world-dominion" is not Hebrew in origin. This he seeks to prove by referring to the phrase in Ps. 72:8 which

makes the "river Euphrates" the centre of the empire. He even asserts that the figure, "like unto a son of man" in Daniel,[31] is of foreign origin, parallel with Messiah and afterwards identified with Him.[32] Sellin[33] thinks the title in Daniel refers to the primal man of Paradise, the Messiah transformed, who is to return once more. He would admit slight foreign influence. So does Clemen.[34] So does Oesterley,[35] although the last two regard as small the foreign influence on the development of Israel's messianic hope. Emmet has hit the nail on the head by asserting:[36] "So far from the Davidic Messiah being the precipitation of widely diffused ideas of a world-Savior, the latter seems to have developed later as an offspring of the union of national and eschatological hopes."[37] That is, although there must have been some foreign influence (Persian and Babylonian) in the development of the eschatological phases of the messianic hope,[38] yet, as Sellin expresses it,[39] "The ancient East knows no eschatological King." The idea of a personal Messiah is not found in non-Jewish literature.[40] Likewise, the older messianic hope of a Golden Age for Israel is a Hebrew idea born in the hearts of the patriachs and other early religious leaders through inspiration of the promises to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and especially the promise of Jehovah, at the deliverance from bondage in Egypt, to be their God and to lead them to the land of plenty, peace and prosperity. While some of the eschatological functions of the Messiah may have been developed partially by contact with Persian and Babylonian thought, the original messianic hope is of Hebrew origin, and in toto the idea of a personal Messiah is Jewish in origin.

2 *The Growth of the Messianic Idea Without a Personal Messiah.* Schürer correctly says:[41] "The older messianic hope . . . is nothing else than the hope for a better future for the nation." This hope, we have seen, was grounded upon the promise of Jehovah to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and especially the promise on the redemption from Egypt to be their "King" and to make them a holy nation. So at first this hope was solely the spirit of nationalism. Only Israel would enjoy the blessings promised in the era of happiness. In that Golden Age "the holy nation" shall be undisturbed by the nations or the forces of nature—the former destroyed if they did not submit to Israel, in the latter realm natural evils would be abol-

ished and the powers of nature increased to contribute her fruits to the happiness of the people of Jehovah.

Unique is the prophecy of Balaam,[42] a prophet outside of Israel, that the kingdom of Jehovah's people should conquer all the nations and maintain a universal dominion over all their enemies. The early prophets do not advance much beyond this nationalistic hope. Amos pronounces Jehovah's judgment on the surrounding nations, Aramaeans, Philistines, Ammonites, and advances to the conception that He has a right to judge them, but does not intimate that they might, on repentance, share the blessings of the messianic hope.[43] However, after denouncing Israel's sins he promises the messianic blessing to follow punishment and purification. This is the climax of his prophetic utterances; that is, as they stand in the Hebrew scroll. However, it is possible that 9:8c-15 is "a later gloss" from the Exile.[44] If so, there is no distinct promise in Amos of the restoration of the Davidic dynasty and the return of Israel from the Exile.[45] There is scarcely a gleam even of the national hope, if these closing words are from the hand of a prophet in the Exile.

But Hosea finds hope for Israel, although as unfaithful as the wife of the prophet. This hope is grounded in the unchanging and unchangeable love of the divine Lover.[46] As Hosea continued to love an adulterous wife,[47] so Jehovah continues to love sinful Israel, and after punishing her for her sins of apostasy, will restore her from exile to prosperity and fellowship with Himself under the dynasty of David.[48] "Afterward shall the children of Israel return and seek Jehovah their God, and David their king, and shall come with fear unto Jehovah, etc."

Isaiah cherishes and expresses a messianic hope that surpasses the previous nationalism. Zion is to be purified and Israel to enjoy the universal kingdom of God. "And it shall come to pass that he that is left in Zion, and he that remaineth in Jerusalem, shall be called holy . . . when Jehovah shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion, and shall have purged the blood of Jerusalem from the midst thereof, by the spirit of justice and by the spirit of burning."[49] Jehovah will provide for purified Jerusalem a "pavilion" and a "shade" and a "refuge" from all harm. Restoration and prosperity are promised but only on condition of purification. Zion shall be the city of the Great King (Jehovah).[50] "There Jehovah will

be with us in majesty . . . Jehovah is our King; He will save us . . . The people that dwell therein shall be forgiven their iniquity."

Also in the later prophets and psalmists shines the hope of a better future after the restoration. Ps. 50 portrays the restoration of Israel under the figure of the vine. So in Zephaniah the voice of warning is raised[51] but also the promise of restoration and security.[52] Jeremiah[53] follows Isaiah in painting Jerusalem as the throne of Jehovah with a reunion of Israel and Judah under the new covenant. "They shall call Jerusalem the throne of Jehovah; . . . the house of Judah shall walk with the house of Israel." So Ps. 24 represents Jehovah as the King of glory. Likewise Ezekiel describes the great purification,[54] the spiritual resurrection,[55] the reunion,[56] and the restoration in the holy sanctuary of Jerusalem.[57] Habbakuk, too, proclaims the advent of Jehovah and in the hope thereof sings with confidence and joy.[58] Briggs says of this inspiring song of hope:[59] "Here the redemption of his people is the chief object in the view of the prophet." Joel describes the salvation of the chosen people in the great and terrible day of God's visitation and the outpouring of the Divine Spirit upon all classes.[60] Daniel[61] sees and sounds forth the promise of the universal kingdom to be enjoyed by the saints of the Most High.[62] His expression "like unto a son of man" scarcely refers to a personal Messiah, but only to a universal dominion of the saints which includes even the dead who will be raised to participate in the messianic blessings.[63]

The hope of a golden future is found even in the apocryphal books of the Old Testament. In Ecclesiasticus is the hope that the dispersed shall be gathered, that the nation shall endure forever under the Davidic dynasty.[64] In the Book of Judith,[65] God judges the heathen; in 2 Maccabees[66] the dispersed shall be gathered and established forever; in 1 Maccabees,[67] the dynasty of David shall continue forever. In the Book of Tobit[68] the righteous in Israel shall be gathered, the nation exalted and Jerusalem rebuilt with gold and precious stones. In the Book of Wisdom[69] the righteous dead in Israel will at last sit in judgment on the heathen.

In the apocalyptic books the national hope of a happy future is still present but has expanded into the larger hope that the universal kingdom includes also the nations, and that this

international kingdom of peace and righteousness will be ruled by the personal Messiah. So we turn back to trace this international, cosmopolitan phase of the messianic hope.

This larger, more inclusive messianic hope began to develop rapidly after the days of Isaiah. It was latent in the promise to Abraham, and Amos began to think of Jehovah, not only as the God of Israel but also of the nations. But when we come to Isaiah and Micah, Israel is the medium of messianic blessing to all the nations. "And it shall come to pass in the latter days, that the mountain of Jehovah's house shall be established on the top of mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of Jehovah, to the house of the God of Jacob: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of Jehovah from Jerusalem."[70] This larger hope that Israel shall bring to the nations the messianic salvation is expressed in Joel,[71] Jonah (theme of book), and in Second Isaiah.[72] Joel says: "And it shall come to pass in the last days that I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh—and it shall come to pass that whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." The Book of Jonah is the story of the larger hope; the God of Israel is also to be the God of Nineveh the enemy of the chosen people. Jonah himself represents the majority in Israel who cherished only the narrow national hope, while the theme of the prophecy is the larger international peace and brotherhood.[73] But in Second Isaiah [74] shines more brightly the larger hope of world-wide blessing through Israel the servant of Jehovah.

> "Listen, oh coasts, unto me.
> And hearken, ye peoples, from far: . . .
> And He said unto me, And Thou art my servant
> Israel, in whom I will beautify myself. . .
> And He said, It is too light a thing that thou
> shouldest be my servant
> To raise up the tribes of Jacob,
> And to restore the preserved of Israel:
> I will therefore give thee for a light to the nations,
> To become my salvation unto the end of the earth."[75]

To save itself alone was too light a thing for Israel. It was be-

neath the dignity of the Divine mission assigned to the chosen nation. Therefore, they should bear the messianic light to the nations and its salvation to the end of the earth.[76] Still Jehovah is the only God and Saviour. "Look unto me and be ye saved, all ye ends of the earth, for I am God, and there is none besides me."[77]

The prophets of the restoration, Zechariah, Haggai, and Malachi, naturally put more emphasis on the return to Jerusalem and the rehabilitation of Israel in the land and in the restoration of the temple worship, and so we do not hear the notes of the universal Kingdom. However, in the apocryphal and apocalyptic books and in Wisdom and in Philo, we find expressed the hope of an universal kingdom. The Book of Tobit reveals the hope that all the heathen shall be converted to Jehovah.[78] In the Sibylline Oracles[79] God from Mt. Zion shall rule the eternal kingdom of peace over all men, who will recognize the law of Jehovah and bring gifts to Him, but the personal Messiah is also recognized. In the Book of Jubilees is described the future age of joy and delight which is conditioned on repentance. No personal Messiah is named. Even Philo,[80] the philosopher and moralist, expressed the hope that all who are converted to the law of God will be gathered in the Holy Land, and enjoy a season of peace and prosperity. He even thinks of physical strength and material riches as a part of the future prosperity.

The idea of the resurrection of the individual Israelite in order to share in this era of peace and prosperity was of late development. The passage in Isaiah[81] which seems to teach the resurrection is not sufficiently evidenced as to its genuineness to warrant us in asserting that the idea of an individual resurrection was entertained in the time of Isaiah. But by the time the Apocalypse of Daniel appears[82] there is clearly expressed a hope in the resurrection, not only of the righteous but also of some of the wicked.[83] Schürer[84] is probably correct in saying, "The hope in a resurrection of the body is for the first time plainly and decidedly expressed" (XII. 2).[85] In the Apocalyptic books which follow, this hope of the resurrection shines forth unceasingly, especially in the Apocalypses of Baruch[86] and 4 Esdras.[87] The resurrection will be universal, including the wicked as well as the righteous; the judgment follows and the righteous are welcomed to Paradise, the wicked

are doomed to the torments of hell.[88] There may be some Christian influences on these books, as many of the New Testament books had already appeared, but, in the main, they reflect the normal development of the messianic idea as held by the non-Christian Jews.[89]

3 *The Origin and Development of the Idea of a Personal Messiah.* We must bear in mind that the advent and reign of Jehovah in the Golden Age is the central doctrine of the Old Testament, even after the idea of the personal Messiah has begun to be cherished and cultivated.[90] And yet from the time of the covenant with David that his dynasty should be perpetuated[91] we may predicate a gradual growth of the idea and hope of the coming of the personal King, of the stock of David, who should maintain, and even transcend, the glories of the Davidic Kingdom. Also in the Deuteronomic promise that a prophet like Moses should later arise to teach and lead and deliver the people, as did Moses, contributed to the growth of the idea of a personal Messiah.

In the early prophets there is no mention of a personal Messiah—only a possible promise of the restoration of the Davidic dynasty[92] and of the return of Israel under its sway.[93] In Isaiah in the promise of the Immanuel child[94] and of the prince of peace with the four-fold name,[95] there is, at least, a latent expectation of a personal Messiah. Emmet says,[96] "It (the latter) is the clearest and best passage to establish an early expectation of a Messiah."[97] The promise of the spiritual endowment of a Davidic King (11:1f) is also messianic in the personal sense.[98] In Micah[99] there is the hope of a personal Messiah who is to be born at Bethlehem Ephratah, who, as G. A. Smith suggests,[100] though of humble origin, is to be a great and peaceful ruler.[101]

In Jeremiah and Ezekiel the references to a personal Messiah are not clear, especially in the latter.[102] The same is true of Zechariah, Haggai, and Malachi, the prophets of the restoration; however, in Zechariah there is a reference to the coming of a king "riding upon an ass," which, although possibly later than the days of Zechariah,[103] expresses the hope of a personal Messiah who shall come as King of Israel.[104]

Also in many of the Psalms, 2, 4, 5, 72, 89, 110, 132, prominent is the hope of a coming king whose dominion shall be extensive, if not universal. Emmet speaks of these Psalms[105] as

"quasi messianic and at least illustrate the nature of the messianic hope."

Although the early chapters of Second Isaiah describe Israel, or a remnant of Israel, as the servant of Jehovah, according to most scholars, in chapter 53 there is, at least, a latent expectation of a personal Messiah, not the royal but the priestly Messiah by whose stripes the people shall be healed.[106]

Although the personal Messiah is not referred to in the Apocryphal books, Ecclesiasticus, Judith, Tobit, 1 and 2 Maccabees, and Wisdom of Solomon,[107] he is referred to in the Apocalyptic books: in Daniel as "one like unto a son of man" (7:13f); in the Sibylline Oracles[108] as a king; in the Book of Enoch[109] as the pre-existent son of man, the elect one, the righteous, as judge, ruler, champion, revealer; in Psalms of Solomon[110] as a Davidic King who crushes Israel's enemies, cleanses Jerusalem, is himself a righteous king taught of God; mighty through the Divine Spirit he will rule over a great people; in a later Sibylline Oracle,[111] under the despotism of Antony and Cleopatra, as a Holy Prince who shall wield his sceptre over all the earth; not in the Assumption of Moses or the Book of Jubilees[112]; in Baruch[113] as a king and a judge; in 4 Esdras[114] as the Son of God who will conquer all foes by the law without battle and without weapons, and after four hundred years along with others he will die, and afterwards, along with others, rise but the Most High acts as judge to assign some to paradise and others to the pit of hell. The last two books give the climax of the development of the eschatological messianic idea in later Judaism.[115]

4 *The Development of the Doctrine of the Personal Messiah.* Possibly from the 7th century B. C. (the age of Isaiah and Micah) but surely from the time of the exile, the hope of the personal Messiah was *never* wholly extinct in Israel. Baldensperger[116] argues that it disappeared for a short time during the successes of the Maccabean period, but Emmet[117] thinks his conclusion "misrepresents the facts." At any rate, by the opening of the first century, A. D. the hope of a personal Messiah was practically universal, and the main emphasis was upon the royal and militant Messiah, except among the Samaritans who expected the prophetic Messiah.[118]

Our aim in this part of this chapter is to trace the development of the doctrine both of the person and the functions of the

Messiah, as found in the late Jewish writings, and reflected or implied in the New Testament.

(1) *The Prophetic Messiah.* Even if the historical-critical conclusions that Deuteronomy is a product of the age of Josiah[119] be accepted, the promise in 18:15, "Jehovah thy God shall raise up unto thee a prophet, from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me," is possibly a reflection of a historical utterance in a preceding age.[120] So it would seem probable that the idea of a teaching Messiah is older than the idea of a royal Messiah which can be traced no farther back than the promise of Nathan the prophet to David the king.[121] "I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever." Even if the promise of Dt. 18:15 was not uttered originally to designate a prophetic Messiah,[122] the fact that the Apostle Peter saw a fulfillment of it in the person and authority of Jesus as a prophet suggests, at least, that the idea of a prophetic Messiah had been traced by the Jews to this promise. We also find further corroboration of this supposition in 1 Maccabees 14:41 (possibly in 4:46) where reference is made to the prophetic office of the Messiah. Also the fact that Jesus, according to the Fourth Gospel,[123] announced Himself as the teaching Messiah to the woman of Samaria, tends to confirm it. Furthermore, it is to be noted that the Samaritans expected only a prophetic Messiah who through his teaching would restore all things. They must have based this hope upon Dt. 18:15, since they accepted as Scripture only the Pentateuch.[124] By them the Messiah was called Taeb (or Taheb) which seems to signify Restorer.[125] It must be remembered that in the Logia, and in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke (to a considerable extent in Mark) Jesus is preeminently the teaching Messiah.[126]

(2) *The Royal Messiah.* But, by the side of this idea of a prophetic Messiah arose, out of the promise to David, the notion of a royal Messiah, descended from David, who should, as did David, conquer His enemies, and not only restore the kingdom to its Davidic power and glory, but, in a few centuries, would make the Kingdom of God universal. Especially is this hope seen to brighten in the messianic promise of Hosea,[127] "They shall seek their king David"; in Isaiah's promise[128] of the Immanuel king and the wonderful prince of peace; in the "later gloss" of Amos[129]; in the Psalms which promise that the king, called son in Ps. 2:6f., shall dash His

enemies to pieces as a potter his vessels; again described as the ideal man with supremacy over all creation[130]; as the righteous king with a universal dominion celebrating His bridal fete[131]; as the conquering king who is also a priest.[132] Later, in the exile and the restoration, the king is to come from Bethlehem Ephratah, of humble origin but destined to be great[133]; as the king of peace riding upon an ass.[134]

Especially in the Apocalyptic books the idea of a royal Messiah prevails: in the Sebylline Oracles,[135] though not made prominent[136]; in the original Book of Enoch only hinted,[137] but surely the royal Messiah is meant in the brilliant messianic passages in 37-71[138]; in the Psalms of Solomon[139] the hope of a royal Messiah is emphatically and brilliantly expressed; in a later Sibylline Oracle[140] the holy prince shall sway his sceptre over all the earth. As seen above, though strange it seems, no Messiah is mentioned in the Assumption of Moses and the Book of Jubilees. Philo only hints at the royal Messiah.[141] The idea is not in the Book of Wisdom,[142] but is prominent in the late Apocalyptic books, Baruch[143] and 4 Esdras.[144]

It is to be noted that the idea of a royal Messiah is the prevalent one in the first century A. D. The disciples of Jesus, after His continued teaching about the nature of the kingdom, namely, an ethico-spiritual rule of God in and among men, could not tolerate the intimation of His death[145]; yea, even after His crucifixion and resurrection, they talked about His "restoring the kingdom."[146]

(3) *The Militant Messiah.* The idea of the militant Messiah is as old as that of the royal Messiah. The king is to be a warrior and a conqueror. By conquest he establishes the theocratic kingdom. Even the Prince of Peace in Isaiah 9 by conquest becomes the king of Peace.[147] The Hebrew term gibbor, applied to this Prince, suggests the idea of a warrior hero.[148] In Psalm 2 the militant idea is prominent. But especially prominent is the warrior Messiah in the Apocalyptic Books: in Sibylline Oracles[149]; in Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs[150]; possibly the militant idea is in Enoch 37-71, though not prominent; in the later Sibyllist[151] the holy prince with a universal sceptre is not described as a warrior-hero; in the Psalms of Solomon the militant idea is repudiated; the king will not trust in horse or rider, but with the breath of his mouth he subdues the earth.[152] In the New Testament the militant

Messiah is conspicuously absent, except in the Apocalypse[153] where the Lamb is also the warrior-hero who, by His sacrificial death, conquers Satan and the hosts of evil.

(4) *The Suffering, Priestly Messiah.* In the Old Testament there are only three references to the suffering or priestly Messiah: Isaiah 53, Psalms 22 and 110. Most of the liberal scholars fail to see in Isaiah 53 a direct reference to the suffering Messiah.[154] But Geo. Adam Smith, although admitting that the prophet is not consciously designating the suffering Messiah, says:[155] "About five hundred and fifty years after this prophecy was written, a man came forward from among the sons of men . . . In Jesus Christ of Nazareth the dream becomes a reality . . . He accomplishes almost to the last detail the work, the patience and death that are here described as Ideal and Representative."[156]

According to Briggs[157] Psalm 22 is "post-exilic" and refers to "the ideal community." Yet, because of the minute likeness between the sufferer in the Psalm and Jesus on the cross, he thinks "the church" is justified in regarding it as a "messianic Psalm." Its ideal of suffering was designed (by God) "to prepare the minds of the people of God for the ultimate realization of that purpose of redemption in a sufferer who first summed up in his historical experiences this ideal of suffering."

The use of the term "priest" in Psalm 110 only implies but does not emphasize the idea of a suffering Messiah. He is "a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek."[158] Although, in this Psalm, the royal is more prominent than the suffering Messiah, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews[159] felt justified in using this messianic promise as the scriptural starting-point for the elaboration of his doctrine of the suffering Saviour who offered up "Himself" to obtain an "eternal redemption."[160]

The Apocalyptic literature scarcely contains the idea of a suffering Messiah. It is not in 4 Esdras, although the author speaks of Messiah as [161]"dying after reigning 400 years." In the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs[162] the Messiah is descended from Levi and so apparently a priest. But the idea of a suffering Messiah was not cultivated by the Jews in the centuries preceding the Christian era, and so is scarcely entertained at all when Jesus begins to teach. De Wette[163] thinks

the idea is entirely absent from Jewish thinking at that time; on the other hand, Wünsche[164] thinks it is present.

The concession by Trypho the Jew[165] in the second century A. D., that the Messiah must suffer, is urged by Schürer as an argument in favor of the notion of a suffering Messiah. On the other hand, Emmet emphatically asserts,[166] "The admissions of Trypho do not express the Jewish belief." But the disappointment of the disciples on hearing the announcement by Jesus that He must suffer and die,[167] proves that the notion was not universal in the time of Jesus. Indeed, Hillel, a contemporary of Jesus, did not look for a Messiah at all.[168] The majority of the Jews, however, were looking for a kingly and militant Messiah who would snatch the sceptre from the Romans and restore the Davidic kingdom in Jerusalem.[169]

It must not be overlooked that even in the few references in later Jewish literature to a suffering Messiah,[170] there is never a hint that these sufferings might be expiatory. The Messiah ben-Joseph who dies, in contrast with Messiah ben-Judah, does not appear until 135 A. D., and is possibly, as suggested by Emmet,[171] connected with the defeat and death of Bar Kokbha. At any rate, in none of these later messianic conceptions is there any idea that the Messiah is to deliver the people and establish the kingdom by virtue of his sufferings.

(5) *The Eschatological Messiah.* The doctrine of the individual, first made prominent by Jeremiah and Ezekiel,[172] prepared the way for the eschatological idea of the messianic program. Some scholars think the "Persian eschatology as a whole was taken over by Jewish thought."[173] However this may be, in the later pre-christian centuries, the hope of a resurrection was entertained, so as to include righteous Israelites of past generations. There may be a hint at a resurrection of the dead in Isaiah 26:19: "Thy dead shall live." But most Old Testament scholars place this prophecy after the exile, and so there is no clear teaching on the subject prior to the exile.[174] Indeed, this prophecy may not refer at all to the resurrection of the body,[175] the doctrine elaborated in later Judaism and held by the Pharisees and the pious Jews in the first century A. D.[176] Clearly is the hope expressed in Daniel,[177] for the resurrection not only of the righteous but also of the wicked. "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake some to everlasting life and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

According to Schürer,[178] this belief in a general resurrection never became universal. In the time of Jesus the Sadducees denied it[179] Likewise the Essenes claimed the impossibility of a physical resurrection.[180] But from the days of the Maccabees there was gradually developed this belief in the resurrection of the body, especially of the righteous, and in some Apocalyptic books, of the wicked also.[181]

The resurrection was to be followed by the judgment at which the wicked were to be consigned to the pit of hell, the righteous rewarded in paradise. So we find in 2 Maccabees,[182] Enoch,[183] Psalms of Solomon,[184] the Apocalypses of Baruch[185] and 4 Esdras,[186] in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs,[187] in the writings of Josephus,[188] and in the Mishna.[189] Although the idea of an intermediate state for the righteous before their admittance to paradise is found in the Apocalypses of Baruch[190] and 4 Esdras,[191] the hope of immediate entrance into paradise of eminent saints like Enoch, Elijah, Ezra is also found in 4 Esdras.[192] As to the time of the resurrection and judgment, whether at the beginning or at the close of the messianic era there was no uniformity of belief,[193] the former being prevalent in Daniel and Enoch, the latter in Baruch and 4 Esdras.[194]

As a part of the eschatological function of the Messiah there was also developed, during the period just before the Christian era, the idea that He should exercise a judicial function; that He should separate the wicked from the righteous assigning each to their eternal destiny. Especially is this idea expressed in the parables of Enoch,[195] in the Psalms of Solomon,[196] and in the Apocalypse of Baruch.[197] By the first century A. D. the eschatological functions of the Messianic were fairly defined in the minds of the Apocalyptic writers. So in the New Testament is set forth the judicial function of Jesus as a part of the eschatological program, especially in the Synoptic Gospels,[198] in Acts,[199] in the Epistle of James,[200] in the Epistles of Paul,[201] and in the Apocalypse of John.[202]

(6) *The Person of the Messiah.* At first the hope was for theocratic kings of the Davidic dynasty; later of *the* king who should be a "son of David." The Messiah, at first, was conceived as only a man. But He is to be endowed with superhuman gifts and powers. He is to be righteous, free from sin, and the Spirit of Jehovah is to be upon Him.[203] But by the time the parables of Enoch (37-71) were written He is thought

of as pre-existent and, in some sense, a Supernatural Being. In this book He is called the Son of man, the Elect, which implies that He is a man but sustains an intimate relation to God as His chosen representative to set up the messianic kingdom. In the Ascension of Isaiah He is called the Beloved (of Jehovah),[204] while in Enoch,[205] Psalms of Solomon,[206] and in 4 Esdras,[207] He is called the Beloved Son. In 4 Esdras He is more specifically designated the Son of God[208] who will conquer all His foes by the law without battle or weapons. This term must carry with it the idea of Divine endowment for so supernatural achievements, but probably it does not connote a Superhuman Being. This is the natural conclusion, for although this person of supernatural achievements reigns 400 years, He afterwards dies as all men do.[209]

Since His pre-existence is clearly taught in Enoch and 4 Esdras,[210] Schürer is correct in claiming[211] that the later Jews expected the Messiah to be a human king of the dynasty of David, but, in some sense, before His appearance on earth, He had been hidden with God. In the eschatological program, according to the parables of Enoch,[212] the Apocalypses of Baruch and 4 Esdras,[213] the Messiah is exalted to judicial powers and functions, and either alone or in co-operation with God, judges the nations and determines the destinies of men.

After the Christians began to emphasize the Divine personality of Jesus, the Jews ceased to stress the pre-existence and Divine character of the Messiah. In post-Christian Judaism Messiah is only a man, a son of David.[214]

5 *A Kindred Conception in the Pagan Religions.* Strange as it may seem, even beyond the boundaries of Palestine, the religious consciousness was being awakened in the centuries immediately preceding the Christian era. Although there is little doubt now entertained on the part of modern scholars that the messianic idea, as set forth in the Old Testament and the later Jewish literature, is Hebrew in origin, yet it must be conceded that a similar hope was cherished by pagan peoples, in Egypt, Persia, Syria, and later in many parts of the Græco-Roman empire.

Even as early as the Twelfth Dynasty (ca. 1800 B. C.)[215] an Egyptian prophet, after predicting the overthrow of the present social and political order, proclaimed the hope of a coming Deliverer "to restore the land." "A Saviour will restore the

land. . . . Men shall say, 'He is the shepherd of all the people, there is no evil in his heart.' If his flocks go astray, he will spend the day in search for them. Would that he might achieve their rescue. Verily he will smite evil when he raises his arm against it. . . Where is his day?"[216] Observe, the coming one is to be a saviour and a shepherd. How graphically this Egyptian prophet anticipates the shepherd idea of Ezekiel, Psalms, and Zechariah! Even the Good Shepherd, who lays down His life for the sheep, is anticipated in the prophecy that the coming king shall "spend the day in search for the lost sheep."

Emmet[217] has shown that there is a striking similarity in the Parsee hope of the coming of Saoshyant as the representative of Zarathustra.[218] Lietzmann[219] and others[220] have shown that there is expressed in Vergil's Eclogues the idea of a "World-Saviour."

Lietzmann thinks this hope of a "World-Saviour" was a common religious belief during the time of the kingdoms of Egypt and Syria.[221] E. W. Meyer,[222] Brückner, [223] Friedländer,[224] and Bousset,[225] not to mention other experts in the field of comparative religions, have brought to light historical facts which point to a common belief in "a dying and rising Saviour-god." This belief is common in the Adonis, Osiris, Serapis, Mithra, and other mystery cults of the first and second centuries of the Christian era. Kirsopp Lake[226] has gone so far as to assert that the church in Corinth accepted christianity as a mystery religion and Jesus Christ as a Saviour-God who had passed, by His resurrection, through death to life.

There are also inscriptions of this period which show that the masses of several nations were looking for the coming of a Great Deliverer who is called Saviour.[227] Even as far east as India a similar hope is cherished. There is a wonderful story of Queen Maya's dream[228] which was interpreted to mean that she should bear a son who should be "the Buddha and saviour of the world." It is not strange that, when Augustus ushered in a wonderful era of universal peace, he should be called Deliverer or Saviour.[229]

This (almost) universal hope for the coming of a World-Saviour is not to be explained by the presence of Jews, with their messianic hope, in nearly all pagan lands . . . especially of the Roman Empire. No doubt the Dispersion[230] had influ-

enced the morals, conduct and religious beliefs of Gentiles among whom they lived, but it is quite sure from historical data that the general pagan expectation of a Great Deliverer or Illuminator (as in India) is not traceable to the influence of the messianic hope among the Dispersion. It is to be explained only on the ground of a universal religious consciousness. Men of all nations and all races, as they grope in the darkness of sin and ignorance concerning their present problems and their future destiny, are intuitively inclined to look up to God and forward to a future life. The universal need of light and salvation, coupled with the innate religious instinct of man, have given rise to these hopes of deliverance through some Great Saviour. Pfleiderer aptly explains it thus:[231] "In general, therefore, it has its ultimate source in the depths of the religious consciousness, in mankind's natural surmise that we are of divine descent."

With this survey of the historical background before us we are ready to inquire into the psychological processes of the christological evolution in the New Testament . . . into the mental and spiritual motives and processes which produced the Christology of the Synoptists, of the early Church, of Paul, of the author of Hebrews, and of the Johannine writings.

NOTES TO CHAPTER II

1. H R E, art. Messiah, p. 570.
2. H J P, div. II. vol. II. 128.
3. ib. 128.
4. Gen. 12:2-3. 5. Gen 15:5.
6. Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, I, 161.
7. Messianic Prophecy, p. 84.
8. Neuer Com. über d. Gen., 1887.
9. ib. 161. 10. Gen. in Epos. Bib. p. 17.
11. O T Th. II. 343. 12. O T Th. 13. So Dods, ib.
14. Cf. Driver, The Book of Gen. with Intro. and notes, '09; Dillmann, Die Gen. 1892; Skinner, Gen. ICC; Davison, Th. of O. T., 367.
15. Ex 6:7-8. 16. Ex 19:6.
17. Art. Messiah, Int. St. Bib. Enc. 18. Gen. 49: 8-12.
19. ib. 338. 20. Geschichte d. Volkes Israel, V. 135ff.
21. ib. 22. ib. 97ff. 23. ib.
24. ib. Cf. esp. Robinson, Religious Ideas of the Old Testament, pp. 186ff. for emphasis on the "covenant" idea in the messianic hope based on the promises to Abr., Isaac, and Jacob, but

esp. upon the "redemption "from Egypt, and the covenant at Sinai based upon it.

25. ib. as above.

26. Schöpfung u. Chaos, 1895.

27. Der Ursprung d. israelitischen—Jud. Eschatologie, pp. 142ff.

28. Bible Problems, 1904.

29. Cf. Emmet, H R E, 574f.

30. ib. 285ff.

31. 7:13f. 32. Cf. Emmet, ib. 574. 33. Der alttest. Prophetismus, p. 177.

34. Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources, p. 82.

35. Evolution of the Messianic Idea, 1908. 36. ib. 575.

37. Cf. Gray, Isa. in ICC, p. 126, who likewise does not follow Gressmann.

38. Cf. Charles, Eschatology, Hebrew, Jewish, and Christian, 1913; Fairweather, art. Development of Doctrine, etc. H D B, V.

39. ib. 177.

40. Cf. Gardiner, Admonitions of an Egyptian Sage, 1909, who has shown the Leyden and Golenischeff Papyri do not refer to a Messiah but Egyptian kings.

41. ib. II. II. 129.

42. Num. 24: 17-24.

43. Cf. chs. I and II. 44. So Wellhausen, Marti, G. A. Smith, Emmet, Harper (Amos and Hosea). 45. 9:8 f.; cf. Harper, ib. 193. G. A. Smith, The Bk. of Twelve Prophets, 182, for excision of the promise; on the other hand, Welch, The Religion of Israel under the kingdom, p. 261, is uncertain, while Sellin, Der alttest. Prophetismus, '12, p. 168f, ascribes it to Amos (Cf. his recent Intro. to O. T.)

46. Cf. Kent, Social Teachings of the Prophets and Jesus, p. 53 f.

47. Chs. 1-3; whether history or parable (cf. HDB) the messianic idea is the same.

48. 3:5; so Harper and G. A. Smith, but Marti and Voltz excise.

49. 4:3-6. 50. 33: 13-24. 51. 1:14-18.

52. 3:11-20; cf. J. M. P. Smith, ICC, who regards this promise as by a "late writer."

53. 3:14-18; 31:31f. cf. ICC.

54. 36:25-35 55. 37:7-14. 56. 37:21-28.

57. Chs. 40-49. 58. Ch. 3.

59. ib. 236; cf. ICC; also Emmet, ib.

60. The phrase "upon all flesh" (2:28) is a hint at the international hope. 61. 2:44; cf. 7:13f: 12:2 (eschatological).

62. So Schurer, ib. II: II 137: Driver, Dan. in C. B.; Emmet, ib.

63. 12:2: cf. Driver, ad loc.; Emmet, ib.; Schurer, ib. II: II.

64. 33:11; 37; 25; 40:13: 47:11, etc. 65. 16:17.

66. 2:18; 14:15. 67. 2:57. 68. 13:12-18; 14:7.

69. 3:8; 5:1; cf. I Cor. 6:2f., and ICC, ad loc. In the Book of

Wisdom the reference is to spiritual immortality, not to physical resurrection.

70. Isa. 2:2-3; also Mic. 4:1-2; cf; also Isa. 19:16-25, for the optimistic picture of international peace in the future Golden Age.

71. 2:28-32; cf. G. A. Smith, ad loc.; art. Joel in HDB, by Cameron; Int. St. Bib. Ency. by Jas. Robertson.

72. This author is not now interested in the question of the authorship of Isa. 40ff., but uses this designation which is familiar to O. T. scholars.

73. Cf. art. Jonah, H. D. B. by König; Int. St. Bib. Ency. by Sampey. 74. 42ff.

75. Trans. by Briggs, Mes. Proph. 353.

76. Cf. G. A. Smith, Isa. II. ad loc.

77. 45:23; cf. Briggs ib. 379; Smith, ib. and Isa. 60, for idea of Jehovah as Saviour and Redeemer of Israel, which Briggs, p. 397, calls "the gem of the book."

78. 13:11; 14:6,7. 79. III. 743-767.

80. De Exsecrationibus, secs. 8-9, ed. Mang. II. 435 ff; De Praemiis et Poenis, secs. 15-20, Mang. II. 421-28ff.

81. 26:19, cf. Gray, ICC; G. A. Smith, Isa. Vol. I.

82. About 167-165, cf. Schürer, H. J. P. II. 137; Driver, ib. art. Daniel, HDB, by Curtis; Int. St. Bib. Ency. by Wilson.

83. 12:2. 84. ib. 138.

85. Cf. Ps. 16:11, which does not clearly and unmistakably express a hope in the resurrection of the body; only in the persistence of life after death; cf. Briggs, ICC; for conservative view, cf. Easton, art. Resurrection, Int. St. Bib. Ency.

86. Esp. chaps. 30, 50, and 51. 87. cf. 6:1-17; 7:29-35.

88. These two books are dated by Schürer in the last decades of the first century after the desecration of the temple; ib. 150.

89. Cf. Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudopigrapha, etc., Eschatology, etc.

90. So Kautzsch, Rel. of Israel, HDB. Vol. V. 694, 718, Dalman, ib. 295f.; Sellin, ib. 193; Emmet, ib. 574.

91. 2 Sam. 7:11-16.

92. Am. 9:11f.; cf. discussion above. 93. Hos. 3:5; cf. above.

94. 7:14ff; cf. Gray, ad loc. 95. 9:6ff; cf. Gray ad loc.; Gressmann, ib. 272f. thinks it must be understood as a part of the pagan hope for a divine Saviour-child; Emmet, ib. 572, speaks of "the mythological background" of the passage.

96. ib. 572. 97. Clemen, ib. 145, thinks it "perhaps mythological."

98. Emmet, ib. 572, thinks it exilic in origin.

99. 5:2f. 100. The Twelve Prophets, 413f.

101. Cf. J. M. P. Smith, ICC, who thinks it messianic but a "late gloss" interpreting Isa. 7:14.

102. So Emmet, ib. 573. 103. So Emmet, ib. 573.

104. Cf. Briggs, ib. 494.

105. ib. 573; cf. Briggs, ib.; also ICC, for emphasis on their mes. sig.

106. So G. A. Smith, ib. ad loc.; Emmet, ib. 576; cf. Westcott, Intro. to Study of Four Gospels, 169ff, for detailed list of messianic passages as so understood by N. T. and Jewish writers, with comparison.

107. Wis. Sol. 2:12-20, "righteous man" not messianic; cf. Schürer, ib. II. II. 139. 108. III. 562f, 780f; cf. Schürer, 140f.

109. 37-71. 110. 18-23-35. 111. III. 36-92. 112. So Schürer, ib. 144f.

113. 72: 2-6; chs. 73, 74; cf. chs. 33, 50, 51.

114. 13:25-28, 32-38; 7;27-35. 115. Cf. Charles, Eschatology, etc.

116. Die mes. u. apoc. Hoffnungen d. Judentums, '03, pp. 92ff.; so Kautzsch, ib. 727.

117. ib. 577.

118. Cf. Jno. 4:25.

119. So Driver, Intro. to Lit. of O. T. and Dt. in ICC.

120. Cf. Driver, Dt. in ICC, ad loc.

121. 2 Sam. 7:13.

122. So Emmet, ib. 574— "a succession of prophets"; so Driver, ICC, ad loc.; so Montgomery. The Samaritans the Earliest Jewish Sect, '07, p. 322f.; so Jackson and Lake, ib. 405.

123. 4:26; cf. Godet, Meyer, Westcott, ad loc.

124. So W. J. Moulton, art. Samaritans, HRE; Davidson, ib. 368.

125. So Moulton, ib. 166; so Cowley, E. B. IV. 4264 ff.; cf. JE, X.68f.

126. Cf. in this monograph chs. 4-7.

127. 3:5. 128. 7:14f., 9:6f. 129. 9:11f.

130. Ps. 8; cf. Briggs, ICC; Patrick, Camb. Bib.

131. Ps. 45, 72. 132. Ps. 110.

133. So J. M. P. Smith, ICC; Emmet, ib., et al.

134. Zech. 9:9f. 135. III. 652f. 136. So Schürer, ib. 140f.

137. 90:37f.

138. Cf. Schürer, ib. 144, for the uncertainty as to date of these chaps. May be later than Pss. of Sol.

139. 17:22-35; cf. Burton, A Source Book etc., for the Study of the Teachings of Jesus, 1923—"Instead of accepting Jno. Hyracanus as Messiah they predict the coming of a Davidic Messiah of high moral and religious character."

140. III. 46-50.

141. So Schürer, ib. 148; but Drummond, art. Philo, HDB, V; also Philo Judaeus, II. 322; Emmet, ib., think the hope in Philo is dim, if present at all.

142. So Schürer, ib. 139.

143. Chs. 74, 77.

144. Ch. 13, though not so prominent as in Baruch. Cf. Westcott, ib. 135, for the royal Messiah in the Targuns of Onkelos, Jonathan, et al.

145. Mk. 8:32.

146. Ac. 1:6; cf. Jno. 6:15, where superficial followers of Jesus sought to "make Him king."

147. Cf. Gray, ICC; Geo. A. Smith, ad loc.; Emmet, ib.
148. See Briggs—Driver—Brown, Lex. sub voce.
149. III. 653f. 150. Test. Jos. 19:18 (only a hint, referring to a Mac. king; so Charles, I. CXIII.
151. III. 46-50; in Philo, de Proem. et Poen, 15-20, the militant idea is present.
152. 17:36-39; also absent from Philo (so Emmet, ib. 576).
153. 17:14; cf. 5:6; 7:17; 14:1, 4; cf. Charles I. CXIII.
154. So Duhm, Cheyne, et al. 155. Ex. Bib. II. 367.
156. Cf. Driver and Neubaur, Jewish Interpreters of Isa. 53, p. 187. Cf. Robinson, Religious Ideas of the Old Testament, 176f.; Cheyne, Isa. ed. 5, II. 45, for view that there is "vicarious atonement" in Isa. 53, but the servant is Israel.
157. ICC, I. 191; Mes. Proph. 322 f.; so Kirkpatrick, Camb, Bib.; Davidson, Th. of O. T. 373.
158. 110; 4; cf. Briggs, ICC, II. 374, for date; Maccabean (Bickell, Hitzig et al), "pre-Maccabean" (Briggs and all conservatives) 159. 5:10; 7:1-10; 9:12, 25; 10:14f.
160. Cf. Briggs, Pss. in ICC; also Westcott, Ep. to Heb.; Dods, Heb. in EGT.
161. 7:28-29. 162. Test. Reub. 6:7-12.
163. De Morte Christi Expiatore, p. 148.
164. Die Leiden des Messias, 1870.
165. Justin, Dial. 68, 80f.
166. HRE, 580. 167. Mk. 8:31 (parallels.)
168. Sanhedr. ch. 98; cf. Justin, Dial. 68, 71, 77.
169. Cf. Dalman, Der leidende u. sterbende Messias d. Synagoge in ersten nach. Christ. Jahrhundert, 1888; Schürer, II. II. 184f.
170. Cf. Schürer, ib. 186; O. Schmitz, Die Opferanschauung d. späteren Judentums u. d. Opfer-aussagen d. N. T. '10, pp. 1-10, for comparison of Jewish and Christian views of atonement.
171. ib. 580; cf. Bousset, Rel. d. Judentums, p. 264, AntiChrist Legend, p. 102, for view that Mes. ben-Joseph was the Messiah of ten tribes (denied in art. Messiah, J. E.)
172. Cf. Davidson, ib. 399ff. 173. Jackson and Lake, ib. 34f.
174. Cf. Gray, ICC; Geo. A. Smith, ad loc.
175. So Delitzsch, Com. 419; Cheyne; Gray, 399; also Smith.
176. Ac. 23:6; Jno. 11:24. 177. 12:2; cf. Driver, ad loc; Briggs, ib. 427. 178. ib. 132.
179. Mk. 12:18; cf. art. Sadducees, HDB; Int. St. Bib. Enc.
180. Josephus, Ant. 18: 1.5; Wars 2. 8. 11.
181. Cf. Fairweather, Development of Doctrine, HDB, V; Emmet, ib; Charles, Eschatology. 182. Chs. 7, 12. 183. 51:1.
184. 3:16; 14:2ff. 185. 30: 1-5; 50: 1; 51: 6-13.
186. 7:32. 187. Test. Jud. 35; Test. Benj. 10.
188. Ant. 18: 1; 3; Wars. 2. 8. 14. 189. Sanhedr. 10:1.
190. 30:2. 191. 4:25, 41; 7:32.
192. 14:9; cf. Weber, System; Wettstein, Nov. Test, 322f.
193. Schürer, ib. 188. 194. Refs. above.
195. 37-71. 196. 17:23ff.

197. 72:2-6; cf. Jackson and Lake, ib. Pt. I. Vol. I. 273-278; for the influence of Persian eschatology on Jewish, cf. same, pp. 34f; art. Eschatology, HRE; Charles, Eschatology.
198. Mt. 25:31ff.; Mk. 13, etc.
199. 10:42. 200. 5:9.
201. Cf. esp. 2 Cor. 5:10; cf. Jackson and Lake, ib. 37, who say the hope of the future life and resurrection "in 50 A. D. was epoch-making"; cf. also Kautzsch, Die Apocryphe u. Pseudepigraphe des A. T. II. 370.
202. 14:14, 18-20.
203. So Pss. of Sol. 17:35-46; Or Sib. III. 49; (holy prince); cf. Emmet, ib. 572, for influence of Isa. II: 1-5 on later developments of Messiah's person.
204. Cf. Moffatt, Th. of Gospels, 165.
205. 105:2. 206. 17:23.
207. 7:28f.; 13:52; 14:9; cf. Westcott, ib. 120f.
208. 13:25-28, 32-38; 7:27-35.
209. 4 Es. 7:29-32. 210. Esp. ch. 13.
211. ib. 141ff.
212. Esp. 49:2-4.
213. Cf. refs. under Eschatological Messiah; cf. Jackson and Lake, ib. 278, who deny that Messiah is judge in 4 Es.
214. Cf. Schürer, ib. 162; Justin, Dial. 49; Wescott, ib. 13f.; Emmet, ib. 580.
215. While the children of Israel were in slavery in Egypt.
216. Quoted by Kent in Social Teachings of the Prophets and Jesus, p. 108f.
217. ib. 218. See arts. Parsiism in Judaism (Gaster) and Parsis, 647 (Mevant) in HRE; also art. Zoroaster (Conway) all fairly conservative in statements of Parsee influence on Jewish religion.
219. Der Weltheiland, ss. 1-25.
220. Mayor, Fowler, Conway, Vergil's Messianic Eclogue, 1907.
221. From 300 B. C. on.
222. Review of Pfleiderer, Religion u. Religiones; cf. Th. Lit. Zeit. '07, No. 11, 138.
223. Der sterbende u. auferstehende Gottheiland in d. orient. Rel. u. ihr. Verhältnis zum Christentum, '08, 248f.
224. Hellenism and Christianity, '13.
225. Kyrios Christos, '21, esp. p. 27.
226. The Early Epistles of Paul. 227. Cf. Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East. 228. See Pfleiderer, The Early Christian Conception of Christ, p. 39.
229. Greek, Σωτήρ, afterwards applied to Jesus in N. T.
230. See art. Judaism, HRE (592f, Loewe) for the influence of Jews in Roman Empire.
231. ib. 156.

CHAPTER III

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF THE CHRISTOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT

Before we begin a historical description of the christological development found in the New Testament, let us try to discover the religious consciousness of those men of God who developed the early Christian teachings and wrote the New Testament. It is conceded by practically all scholars that Jesus Himself is the source and inspiration of their remarkable religious consciousness. Christianity is a historical religion. The historical Jesus started the movement afterwards called Christianity.[1] The disciples, when afterwards convinced that He was alive and still with them, under the dynamic of the Spirit, began to develop their thoughts of His person and mission.[2]

1 *The Consciousness of Jesus.* Whom did Jesus take Himself to be? What is the character of His unique consciousness as incidentally alluded to in the Synoptic Gospels?[3]

(1) *The Unity of His Personality.* To think in harmony with the facts in the Synoptics, we must think of Jesus, not only as a historical personality, but we must think of His personality as a unit. He is not presented as a dual personality with a Divine and a human nature, but as a Divine-human personality in such constant communication with the Father[4] that He conquered all suggestions to sin in His career of struggle and gradual development in moral perfection.[5] As Du Bose[6] has put it, "Here was a consciousness grounded in two natures, yet expressed through an indivisible personality."

(2) *The Dominance of the Spiritual in the Personal Religion of Jesus.* His unbroken communion with the Father was a marked characteristic in His career.[7] As Deissmann expresses it, "Jesus enjoyed a rich prayer-life."[8] Especially is it noticeable that Luke portrays Jesus in a prayer of thanksgiving just before He utters the "Johannine passage" on His unique "personal relationship" with the Father. "I thank thee, O Father,

Lord of Heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent and hast revealed them unto babes."[9] Immediately after this prayer He exclaims: "All things have been delivered to me of my Father, and no one knows who the Son is, save the Father; and no one knows who the Father is, save the Son, and he to whomsoever He willeth to reveal Him"[10] He grew in the knowledge of God as His Father because of His unbroken communion with Him in His prayer-life. He overcame the suggestions from Satan and from His own flesh by maintaining this unbroken fellowship with the Father. In Gethsemane, by prayer, He overcame the impulse to escape the cross and possessed the courage and strength to say,[11] "Nevertheless not what I will, but what thou wilt." The Divine Spirit kept Him in constant, unbroken communion with His Father, and this furnished Him the dynamic for the domination of the altruistic over the selfish, and for the execution, by self-sacrifice, of His messianic program. In His case, as Deissman writes,[12] "Prayer is something self-understood and still not necessary for God; something wonderfully powerful and yet not a magical remedy."

(3) *His Unique Filial Consciousness.* According to the tradition handed down by Luke, even at the age of twelve, Jesus knew Himself as Son and God as His Father. "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?"[13] Surely here we see the dawning of His filial consciousness which is a suggestion of a "personal relationship" to God.[14] Harnack[15] is inclined to deny that the Johannine passage expresses Jesus' consciousness of "a personal relation"[16] to the Father, but merely His consciousness of having an unique knowledge of the Father and so is being vested with authority to make Him known to men. Robertson[17] thinks the filial consciousness of Jesus is clearly expressed in these words.[18] Out of this consciousness that God is His Father, He teaches the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, that the Kingdom of God is love and self-sacrifice; that He Himself is the Messiah to set up that kingdom on earth.

(4) *His Consciousness of God as His Lord.* Although Jesus usually addresses God as His Father, as Deissmann has forcefully brought out in His recent book,[19] He also acknowledges the Lordship of God for Him. This relationship to God is acknowledged in the prayers in Gethsemane, "Thy will be

done."[20] On the cross He cries, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"[21] Jesus knows Himself as Son but He also knows Himself as Servant, the Suffering Servant, who must bow to the agonies of the cross in obedience to the will of the Father as His God.[22] This is an essential element in the consciousness of Jesus. Out of these two basic elements in His religious consciousness are unfolded His sublime ethico-spiritual teachings about God and the Kingdom and man's relation to both. As Wendt expresses it:[23] "The key to a full understanding of the certainty, clearness and perfection with which Jesus grasped the Scriptural revelation of the fatherly love of God is not found in mere influence of the piety of His parents. That key must be sought in the peculiar power which belonged to Himself, and which He felt to be a miraculous Divine endowment." Deissmann[24] puts still more emphasis on the consciousness of Jesus. "Behind every word there stands for a moment Jesus Himself."

(5) *His Consciousness of Sinlessness.* His communion with His Father was so complete and His submission to the Lordship of God was so perfect that He had no sense of sin. The tenor of the Synoptic teaching is that Jesus was never conscious of sinning in thought or word or deed. He never prays in penitence, as He taught His disciples to pray, "Forgive us our debts." On the other hand, He claims to have "authority to forgive sins on earth."[25] He places Himself outside the rank of sinners when He declares that His blood is to be shed for the "remission of sins."[26] A few scholars still deny the sinlessness of Jesus[27] while others, as Durant Drake[28] (rather dogmatically), deny the possibility of ever knowing that He was absolutely without sin. On the other hand, Max Meyer[29] positively asserts the sinlessness of Jesus, claiming that all "temptations came to Him from without."

(6) *His Prophetic Consciousness Culminating in His Messianic Consciousness.* According to Deissmann,[30] Jesus' filial consciousness toward God as His Father and His submission to God as His Lord is "the basal ground-work" of His "specific consciousness, a consciousness of prophetic endowment for His mission; and, finally, the prophetic consciousness culminates in the messianic consciousness." Jesus knew He was "sent," and therefore He says He must "preach the good tidings of the kingdom to other cities also."[31] The prophetic consciousness, so Deissmann argues,[32] is reflected in the emphatic "ego" of the

sermon on the mount, "But *I* say unto you."[33] Out of this prophetic consciousness flows His claim to be greater than Jonah and greater than Solomon. He has a message greater than the Old Testament prophet's message. He comes to build a Kingdom to be greater than "Solomon's glory." Here He expresses His sense of a Divine commission to round out to completion the fragmentary teachings of the Old Testament.

(7) *His Messianic Consciousness.* A few extreme liberals deny to Jesus a messianic consciousness[34]; others concede He felt the messianic consciousness but not until at or after His baptism.[35] On the other hand, all conservatives and many moderate liberals think His messianic consciousness *dawned,* if not at twelve years of age, during those early years of growing consciousness, and gradually developed until it was cogent and potent enough to impel Him to dedicate Himself, by baptism, to the messianic career.[36] Steinbeck[37] is scarcely able to prove from the Synoptic data his extremely conservative view that Jesus was "conscious of His essential Deity," and as such is Redeemer and King of the church. G. Streatfield[38] is more reserved, and more in harmony with the facts in the Synoptics, in expressing his view of Jesus' consciousness of being the Messiah and as such the Founder of the Kingdom with authority to teach its ethico-spiritual principles.

The filial, prophetic, and messianic consciousness of Jesus was a subject of gradual development, until it was strong enough, at His baptism, to impel Him to undertake the messianic role. Even after His baptism, as His filial and prophetic consciousness continued to deepen, He must have reached a stronger and clearer sense of His messianic mission and all it meant in founding the kingdom and redeeming men.

There can be no doubt about the impression which Jesus made upon His followers as to His prophetic and messianic consciousness. When the sermon on the mount was finished, they felt that "He taught as one having authority, and not as the scribes." As He continued thus to teach and to manifest His sinless character and wonderful power, they were more and more impressed that He is the Messiah. Especially, after the crucifixion, when they were convinced He was still alive and still with them, their doubts melted away under the rising sun of a new spiritual consciousness.[39] They are now convinced that He is the Messiah. The ultimate ground of their con-

sciousness of His messiahship is the messianic consciousness of Jesus Himself which impressed itself upon them, not only by what He said and did, but especially by what He was to them and to others. Their personal association with Him is the point of contact between the messianic consciousness of Jesus and their consciousness of His messiahship. According to Deissmann,[40] the messianic consciousness of Jesus led Him on to "His passion and the Cross; to the formation of a new religious community," and "carried the Person of Christ into the centre of Christianity." Moreover, he continues:[41] "The centralization of Christianity on the Person of Christ is of the greatest importance in the development of Christianity as a religion of the people. Christianity does not gather mankind together round a system of religious theories, but round a divine personality." In other words, it makes Christianity a historical religion and makes the historical Jesus the ultimate ground and source of early and later developments in Christology. So Feine can justly claim[42] that not only the Christology of the early church but also that of Paul, "rests on" the consciousness of Jesus expressed in Matthew 11:27 (=Lk. 10:22).

2 *Some General Psychological Principles.* The minds and hearts of the Twelve, and others who became leaders in the early churches, as in Macedonia, Greece, Rome, and Asia, were strongly under the spell of certain psychical impulses.

(1) *Their Devotion to Jesus.* Peter was so devoted to Jesus that when the officers arrested Him he drew his sword in defense of his teacher and friend.[43] But as the officers led Him off to court, the disciples forsook Him and fled. After the appearances of the risen Jesus which convinced them that He was still alive, floods of memories began to pour back, out of their sub-consciousness, into their consciousness, all that Jesus had said about His person and mission, and especially His spirit of love and devotion to them. These memories could but produce in them a personal reaction. They had begun to love Him while they walked with Him in Galilee, so that in that last week of struggle with the leaders in Jerusalem and in the garden at His betrayal and arrest they loved Him intensely enough to fight for Him. But now, as He emerges from the conflict as victor over His foes and over death, and in the power of His Spirit is still living in them and walking with them, their love and devotion to Him master their fears and doubts; they are

willing to go to court and to prison for Him. The love of Christ constrained them, not only in their activities but also in their thinking; especially in their thinking about Him and His relation to them and the messianic movement.

But is such loving devotion to a great and good friend a safe moulder of thought? Is love a sane Christology maker? Is it not blind to some historical facts, and so bent to irrational conclusions? Let Deissmann answer. We cannot arrive "at a full understanding of Jesus by the way of historical science." "Jesus is known as much as He is loved."[44] Deissmann pleads for the "psychological method," in connection with the "historical method," in the effort to find the historical Jesus. "The single word of Jesus is not a separate gem, but one of the flashes from the one stone. Behind every word there stands for a moment Jesus Himself."[45]

That is, those first disciples knew Jesus only as they loved Him and were willing to go to court and prison and death for Him. Matthew and Peter, James and John, who afterward wrote down their impressions of Jesus in permanent documents were dominated by their devotion to Him. Three of them, if we are to trust the early Christian tradition, went to the executioner's block, as well as to prison or to exile, because they loved Him. They knew that He laid down His life for them, and so they loved Him with a devotion that death could not destroy or diminish.

But why did they love Him so? And why did they adore and worship Him? Professor McGiffert,[46] a sensitive historian, concedes that not only the Gentile Christians, but even Paul and John and early Jewish Christians "worshipped Jesus as Son of God, and even as God." But this adoring love meant the unfolding, in them, of moral and spiritual character and their attainment, through communion with the Christ, of a rich and mature personality. They tried to love and help, to serve and die as He did. That is, they reached maturity by losing themselves in Jesus. They illustrated what a modern psychologist has said, "In maturity lose thyself."[47] Those early disciples "lost themselves" in Jesus as their Christ. But they reached "maturity" in so doing; maturity in thought and character and conduct. In their love and devotion to Jesus they ceased to be cowards and weaklings, they began to be heroes and giants. Through their hearts their minds were ex-

panded and elevated. Even fishermen and tax-collectors were transformed into religious thinkers and writers—not into philosophers and literary experts, but into simple memorandum makers and story tellers of the things their great and good Friend had said and done.

(2) *The Subjective Element a Part of the Picture of Jesus.* Though honest as they could be, these men of personal devotion to Jesus could not express their impression of Him without expressing their own experiences with Him and of Him. David Glass[48] in a recent paper before the Rawdon College Brotherhood, has a finely discriminating statement of the case: "Clearly, then, we cannot get away from the human element in the record. No recorded fact can be separated from the subjective interpretation in which it is presented to the mind. The 'thing in itself' does not exist apart from the human perception of it. An experience is a fact realized by a thinking subject; that subject is affected by it; a certain reaction is set up; interpretation follows, and the fact cannot be stated without the accompanying interpretation. Now, this subjective factor is not necessarily an irrelevance or a distortion, to be detected if possible and cut out. It is itself part of the complex truth, and the total resultant experience is the revelation." That is, to illustrate, when Matthew jotted down the "sayings" of Jesus in his famous memorandum book, he first made "a subjective interpretation" of an address or a parable or a single saying of Jesus, and then proceeded to put into words his "interpretation" of what he thought Jesus meant. In the whole collection are included "sayings" about the Son of man, the Son of God, the teaching, royal, and eschatological Messiah, In other words, Matthew, an ear-witness in the inner circle of the Twelve,[49] understood Jesus to be designating Himself the Son of man, the Son of God, and the Messiah. But did Jesus mean to say what Matthew thought He meant to say? The historical evidence is overwhelmingly in favor of an affirmative answer. It is evident that Matthew understood Jesus to be a real man, but at the same time a man with ideals higher than ordinary men; yea, a man who in some unique sense is the Son of God and as such "knows the Father," and because of this unique Sonship becomes the Messiah. This is clearly Matthew's "subjective interpretation" of the Jesus whom he knew and heard. But is the picture of Jesus which Matthew

gives us in the "Sayings" identical with the historical Jesus? Pfleiderer, although not discussing the Logia in particular but the portrait of Christ in the New Testament, is inclined to overemphasize the "subjective" element in it and to predicate the impossibility of "absolute certainty" that this portrait corresponds to the actual Jesus. "Jewish prophecy, Rabbinic teaching, Oriental gnosis, and Greek philosophy had already mingled their colors upon the palette from which the portrait of Christ in the New Testament Scriptures was painted. And so all that can be determined with certainty from these writings is only that conception of Christ which was the object of the faith of the early Christian communities and their teachers."[50] He furthermore admits[51] that "the reminiscences of the early disciples" "contributed a most important element to this conception," but "how much is due to genuine historical reminiscence, and how much is derived from other sources, is a problem which can never be solved with absolute certainty." Of course, it is true that in the New Testament we "find that conception of Christ which was the object of the faith" of the early disciples. But is that the "only" picture we find? If, "the conception of Christ" entertained by the early disciples is "part of the thing itself" (the actual Jesus of history), as far as it goes, we are certain that this "subjective interpretation," this "conception of Christ by the early Christians," is "part" of the whole portrait of the historical Jesus. Surely no one contends that the early disciples have given us the complete portrait of Jesus as He was. That would be a psychological impossibility. But, on the other hand, these honest men who loved Jesus, by means of their "reminiscences" of Him, His words, His actions, and His spirit, have evidently given us an honest, if not complete, picture of the real Jesus.

Just a word must be said of Bacon's contention that all the Gospels, even Mark,[53] are written by "Paulinists." But he admits that the Logia is free from Paulinism,[54] and is, therefore, our only refuge for finding the historical Jesus. So we may conclude that this earliest picture of Jesus, the product of "reminiscences" of Jesus by an honest Apostle, Matthew, who was, for the most of his record, an ear-witness, approximates as nearly as a human interpreter could, the veritable picture of the real Jesus. It is quite true that, when one reads most of the ancient, mediaeval, and modern Christologies, he "must

break through a thousand professional interpreters to the Master Himself and hear His living unamended Word, see Him at His gracious ministries." Not so in reading the Logia (as reproduced in chapter IV), or even Mark or Matthew or Luke. In the two original sources, the Logia and Mark, "we see the Master Himself and hear His living unamended Word."

(3) *Consciousness of His Messiahship and Saviourhood.* Matthew in the Logia and Mark in his Gospel are keenly conscious of the messiahship of Jesus. He is the teaching, royal and eschatological Messiah as painted in the Logia; in addition to all this, in Mark's Gospel He is the suffering, redeeming Messiah. That is, Mark is conscious of His Saviourhood[55] as a necessary function of the Messiah. The Gospel of Matthew[56] makes the author conscious of Jesus' Saviourhood. "Thou shalt call His name Jesus; for it is that He shall save His people from their sins." To Luke He is the Saviour of publicans and sinners, street women and thieves.[57] To Paul He is the Reconciler and Redeemer of Jews and Gentiles, all of whom are sinners.[58] To the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews He is the Great High Priest who brings sinful men to God by the sacrifice of Himself.[59] To John He is the Advocate with the Father who is "the propiation for the sins of the whole world;" He is the "Saviour of the World."[60]

(4) *Consciousness of Communion with Jesus as Their Lord.* This consciousness, clearly seen in the later disciples, is not emphasized in the Logia and Matthew, in Mark and the Epistle of James. However, it is latent in these earliest pictures of Jesus. Even in the Logia Jesus alone can give the heavy laden spiritual rest; can make the Father known to them in His love and forgiveness.[61] Mark is conscious that Jesus "gave His life a ransom for many;" that He shed His blood to ratify the covenant of fellowship between God and forgiven sinners.[62] James knows that a living faith in Jesus as the Christ and the Lord saves.[63] It is evident that Luke, Peter, Paul, the author of Hebrews, and John write out of the full consciousness of living spiritual communion with Jesus as Saviour and Lord.[64] This experience of living fellowship with the conquering Christ is the life studio from which is painted the portrait of the New Testament Christ.[65]

(5) *Consciousness of a Divine Appointment to make Jesus Known as Messiah and Lord.* The Twelve had been ap-

pointed by Jesus to "be with Him," to be "Apostles," messengers to carry His message of the Kingdom to others; especially to carry out, after His death, the program initiated by Him.[66] From Pentecost on these leaders of the early church, and other leaders arising later, as James and Paul, had an abiding consciousness that they were the messengers of Jesus to make Him and His message known to men. This laid upon them the responsibility to know Him themselves; to know His relation to God and to them as His disciples and to all men. This led them to become Christology makers. The early leaders used their common Jewish terms to set forth their conceptions of Him—Christ, the Christ; Servant of God, Lord.[67] It was not until Paul came upon the scene that Jesus was called by the disciples Son of God. From that time on He is worshipped as the Son of God, the Logos, and even as God.[68] But all these leaders had a deep consciousness of a Divine mission to make Jesus known as Saviour and Lord. This consciousness was the common property of all the first century Christology makers.

(6) *Consciousness of Spiritual Leadership for the Task.* Not all of them lay direct claim to such leadership of the Divine Spirit, and yet it is implied in their attitude and words. Matthew and Mark make no specific claim to it. Nor does Luke, but it is an implication of the introduction to his Gospel; yea, of his whole Gospel, which emphasizes the enduement and leading of Jesus and His disciples by the Spirit.[70] Luke emphasizes the spiritual leadership of Peter, James, John, and Paul.[71] Peter, in the Book of Acts, and Paul and John make direct claim to the leadership of the Spirit in their task of making Jesus known as Saviour, Son, and Lord.[72]

So, as we begin our study of the individual sketches, pictures or portraits of Jesus Christ as made by these first century Apostles and Ambassadors, we shall do well to bear in mind their high calling and heavenly task; to remember that they are ever conscious of having in them the Spirit of God to control their thinking and feelings; that thus they are safeguarded against fanaticism in claiming too much for the person and task and teachings of Jesus, and against metaphysical speculations on the union of the Divine and the human in His person, and on how His death could save sinners.[73]

(7) *Progress in the Development of New Testament Chris-*

tology. From the Christ of the Logia and Mark to the Christ of Hebrews and of John is a long road of quiet reflection and personal experience on the part of the early apostles and other spiritual leaders. Through the thick underbrush and briars and brambles of divergent interpretations of the words of His lips, of the works of His hands, and the events of His life they blazed the path to the summit of the Johannine Christology. Common sense and common honesty were their safeguards against extravagant theologizing and fanciful fabrication of Christ-myths. Religious reflection and spiritual experience, sanctified by reminiscences of Him and devotion to His name, spurred them on to fathom the meaning of His character and person, and to know the mission of His life and death. From Pentecost to Paul the early church was in its birth-pangs struggling to give birth to its christological ideas and then to express them in forms and symbols consonant with the experiences of His spiritual presence and compatible with the dignity of His person and the magnitude of His program. From Paul's first sermon and epistle to John's Gospel and the Apocalypse the Gentile churches, in a deadly combat with the Judaizers and the Gnostics, carried to completion the New Testament Christology, by the use of other symbols and forms to give expression to their faith in the Divine Sonship and Lordship of Jesus, in vital connection with His real humanity and sufferings to redeem mankind.[74]

3 *Psychological Characteristics of Individual Christology Makers.* As to Matthew and Mark, and the author of the First Gospel, we have no need of further expansion beyond the general psychological characteristics just delineated. But for Luke and Paul, for the author of Hebrews and John, who wrought out the striking Christologies of the New Testament, a few specific psychological traits must be noticed. Temperament, as Professor Coe has well proved, is an important "factor in striking religious transformations."[75] Previous education and present experience also played conspicuous parts in transforming the religious beliefs of these men and in shaping their christological conceptions. They represent different types of religious leaders and have their characteristic "mental traits."[76]

Luke was not a leader of thought or of men, in the ordinary sense of the term. He was a companion of Paul, one of the

greatest leaders of thought and of men. The more he knew of Paul, his system of thought, and his type of Christianity, the more he loved his superior and the more he imbibed his spirit and thought. But he found that the dynamic of Paul's thought and life was his Christ, and Luke was gradually transformed into a Christian of the Pauline type. But being a historian he sought to discover the historical Jesus and compare with Him the Christ of Paul. He ransacked all literature available, conversed with Christians who knew Jesus "first-hand," and then with all these "many"[77] sources before him "he traced the course of all things accurately from the first;" then, after selecting those events, words, and parables which appeared to him "accurately" to reproduce the actual Jesus of history, and at the same time to preserve the qualities of "grace" and cosmopolitanism stressed in the Christ of Paul, he "wrote them down in order."[78] He was not only a historian and a man of science who bowed to facts, he was a literary artist, and so has painted for all mankind the first complete portrait of the historical Jesus who is at the same time the Christ of all mankind and the Son of God.[79]

Paul was a mystic, not a philosophical mystic[80] nor a "neurotic" mystic,[81] but a Christian mystic whose mysticism was of the "reacting" type.[82] Deissmann correctly defines mysticism as "directness of intercourse with the Deity;"[83] "salvation as communion with Christ."[84] So it was with Paul. He was saved by entering into "communion with Christ," and this means to Paul "direct intercourse with the Deity." The Pauline type of "reacting mysticism" means that "God takes the initiative."[85] God by His Spirit moved upon Paul who in turn "reacted" or responded by a personal commitment of himself to Christ. His ceaseless communion with Christ is his daily reaction to the Christ who lives in him and becomes the dynamic of his thinking, of his suffering, of his achieving, and finally of his dying on the block.[86] Due consideration of this type of Paul's mystical thinking, the type of a realistic mystic, helps to explain the Christ of Paul, the heavenly Christ who "lays hold" of him in conversion,[87] who lives in him to achieve and to conquer. Paul does not ignore the historical Jesus; he does not pervert the spirit and program of the historical Jesus; he places his supreme emphasis upon the heavenly Christ, the Christ of reacting mysticism, because of his "men-

tal trait" as a mystic and on account of his experience of saving, conquering, achieving "communion with Christ." That is, his "temperament" and his experience are the chief factors in shaping his striking Christology.[88]

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, as a religious leader, exhibits quite a different type of "temperament." He is a "liberal" under the influence of Greek philosophy and culture. At the same time He knows the suffering human Jesus as his personal High Priest through whom he has had real access into the "Holy of Holies."[89] He knew Paul and was influenced by him to regard Christ as the heart of Christianity, and Christianity as the supreme religion for all mankind. But in his "mental traits" is found none of Paul's mysticism. On the other hand, he was a Greek culturist, and his portrait of Jesus is the earliest example of the perfect blending of cosmopolitan culture with the primitive traditions of the historical Jesus. His Christian experience is the connecting link between the primitive tradition and the Greek philosophy. Hence the blend in the portrait of the Jewish idea of sacrifice and the Greek conception of the real as existing "in heaven itself."[90]

The John of the Apocalypse is a seer, a prophet of the apocalyptic type.[91] The John of the Fourth Gospel and the First Epistle is pre-eminently a mystic of the highest order. The same individual could have been both "seer" and mystic, but this and other internal characteristics, at least, suggest two individuals as authors of these widely differing Christologies. In the Apocalypse, the author of this striking Christology is a Jewish Christian seer of the apocalyptic order.[92] He is not responsive to Greek thought and culture. He reacts against the Graeco-Roman culture, government, and religion.

On the other hand, the John of the Fourth Gospel reacts toward Greek thought and adopts a general term of philosophical import (Logos) to express the eternal cosmic features of his Christology. Not to a degree so marked as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews does John reflect the influence of Greek thought and culture, but unmistakably it is present. His idea of incarnation ("The Word was made flesh")[93] is more Hellenic than the idea of a virgin birth as described by Matthew and Luke.[94]

But the dominant characteristic of John is his "Christmysticism." This is Deissmann's compound term to describe the

higher spiritual elements in the Fourth Gospel.[95] "John amalgamated ancient genuine traditions concerning Jesus—traditions which were partly his own reminiscence—with his experience of communion with Christ.—We have in John's Gospel an intimate combination of the traditional conception of Jesus and Christ—mysticism." John was an intense spiritual mystic. By his rich experiences of Jesus as the Christ and as the source of life to him, he felt he had "direct intercourse with the Deity." The Son is the Logos (expression or revelation of the Father). So we see how his experience, a form of Christ-mysticism, becomes the chief factor in painting his master-portrait of Christ the Son, the Logos; of how he blends into his portrait the "traditions" and his own "reminiscences" of the historical Jesus with his experiences of Christ as the Logos and the Son. Coe has made a fine distinction between "oriental and Christian mysticism" by showing[96] that the latter does not, as does the former, "lift" its subject "out of the historical current of religious life into a non-historical revelation." John, mystic as he was and lifting his head into the heavens of a "non-historical revelation" of the eternal Logos, nevertheless kept his feet on the solid ground of the traditions and reminiscences of the historical Jesus.[97] His "mental trait" of mysticism and his willingness to accommodate, somewhat, his Christian conceptions to Greek forms of thought, account for his peculiar but splendid portrait of Christ the Son, the Logos.[98]

NOTES TO CHAPTER III

1 For the mythical origin of Christianity, cf. Sadler, The Origin and Meaning of Christianity, '16.

2. Lk. 24:49; Ac. 1:8; 2:4; Mk. 15:34, etc.

3. Lk. 2:49; Mt. 11:29-Lk. 10:22.

4. Cf. Lk. 2:49; 9:28; 11:1, etc.

5. Cf. Heb. 2:10 f.; 5:9, etc.; cf. Sanday, Christologies Ancient and Modern, p. 77 f., who attempts a psychological explanation of the union of the Divine and human in Jesus, by resorting to the "subliminal consciousness" as the point of contact.

6. The Consciousness of Jesus, p. 28; cf. James, Psychology, 1890; esp. Breese, Psychology, '17, p. 17 f; also Ames, Psychology of Religious Experience, '10, for the modern emphasis on the indivisibility of personality.

7. Cf. Lk. 2:21; 6:12; 18; 9:28; 11:1; Mk. 1:35; 6:46, etc.

8. The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul, '23, p. 48.
9. Lk. 10:21. 10. Lk. 10:22; cf. Mt. 11:25-27.
11. Mk. 14:34, 36; cf. Lk. 22:44; Heb. 5:7.
12. ib. p. 68. 13. 2:49; or "in my Father's house."
14. Cf. Temple, The Boy Consciousness of Jesus, '22.
15. Sayings of Jesus, p. 219.
16. Mt. 11:27, Lk. 10:22.
17. The Christ of the Logia, p. 28 ff.
18. So Bruce, Lk. in EGT, ad loc; so Plummer, Lk. in ICC. ad loc.
19. ib. pp.. 69 ff.
20. Mk. 14:36. 21. Mk. 15:34. 22. Lk. 10:21
23. Teaching of Jesus, tr. by Wilson, I. 93 f.
24. ib. p. 31. 25. Mk. 2:10. 26. Mt. 26:28; cf. Allen, ICC; Plummer, The Gos. Acc. to St. Mt., ad loc., for a discussion of the genuineness of the last phrase. It is admitted that even if he did not utter the phrase, He impressed His disciples with this conception of His mission.
27. So Renan, Life of Jesus, p. 375.
28. The Problems of Religion, 116.
29. Sinlessness of Jesus, 1908.
30. ib. p. 125 f. 31. Lk. 4:43; cf. Mt. 10:40; 15:24.
32. ib. p. 126. 33. In Greek Ἐγώ is very emphatic; cf. Mt. 5:22, 28, 39. 44; also 5:17, 18; 10: 37; 12:6. 41. 42. strong expressions of His prophetic consciousness. Cf. F. A. Christie, art. The Personal Religion of Jesus, Bib. World, Oct. '09—His religious consciousness expressed in His life, then in His teachings.
34. So Bousset, Jesus, '06 (except in some hazy eschatological sense); so Wrede, Das Messiasgeheimnis. '01; so Bundy, The Psychic Health of Jesus, '22, Case, The Alleged Messianic Consciousness of Jesus, Jo. Bib. Lit. XLVI. Pts. I and II. 1-9; also, Jesus: A New Biography, 1927, et al.
35. So Baldensperger, Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu, 1888; Wendt, ib.; Tillmann, Der Menschensohn, etc. '05; H. Holtzmann, Das messianische Bewusstsein Jesu, '09; Beyschlag, ib.; Gilbert. Review of Plummer. Lk. in ICC, A. J. Th., 1897, p. 817; Loisy, Jesus et la. Tradition Evangelique, '10; Deissman, ib. p. 131. For the extreme view that Jesus had an "ego" consciousness and a 'race" consciousness, see W. Walther, D. Ichbewusstsein Jesu gegenueber d. Menschengeschlecht, '14.
36. So Plummer, Lk. in ICC, 77 f.; Sanday, art. Jesus Christ, HDB; Orr, art. Jesus Christ, Int. St. Bib. Enc.; Robertson, Luke the Historian, '20; so Weiss. Stevens, Sheldon, et al. (N.T.Th.); so Edersheim, Farrar, Hanna, D. Smith, et al. in Lives of Christ.
37. Das goettliche Selbstbewusstsein Jesu, '08, s. 57 f.
38. The Self-Interprelation of Jesus Christ, Study of the Messianic Consciousness as Reflected in the Synoptics, '07; cf. also G. Vos, The Self Disclosure of Jesus, 1926, for a complete list of authorities on the self-consciousness of Jesus.

39. Cf. Peter's confession at Caesarea Phillippi, Mk. 8:29, with his address at Pentecost, Ac. 2:32-36.
40. ib. pp. 144 ff.
41. ib. 147.
42. Th. d. N. T. '10, s. 48 f.
43. Mk. 14:47; Mt. 26; 51f.; Lk. 22:50.
44. ib. pp. 20, 23.
45. ib. p. 31.
46. The God of the Early Christians, chs. I and II.
47. Starbuck, Psychology of Religion, p. 408.
48. The Person of Christ in the Synoptic Gospels, 1924, p. 3 f.
49. Cf. Peake, ib. p. 122 for a discussion of the apostolic authorship of the Logia.
50. The Early Christian Conception of Christ, p. 9.
51. ib. pp. 9 and 10.
52. Cf. quotation from Glass above.
53. Cf. our fuller discussion of his views in ch. V.
54. Hibbert Journal Supplement, 1909, p. 214 f.
55. 10:45. 56. 1:21; 20:28, etc.
57. 15: 1 ff.; 7: 36 ff; 23:42 f.
58. Gal. 3:13; 4:4; Rom. 3:21-24; 5:10 f.; 2 Cor. 5:18 ff.
59. 7:25; 9:12, 14, etc. 60. I Jno. 2:2; Jno. 4:42.
61. 11:28-30. 62. 10:45; 14:24.
63. 2: 1, 14.
64. Cf. later discussion in this chapter, under specific psychological characteristics of these men.
65. So McGiffert, The God of the Early Christians, chs. I and II, who sees in the early records proof that, not only "the Gentile Christians, but also Paul and John worshipped Jesus as Son of God." Emphasized by Mackintosh, Originality of the Christian Message, pp. 78 ff.
66. Mt. 10:7 ff; 28:18-20. 67. Ac. 2:31, 33; 3:13, 36, etc; Jas. 2:1, etc.
68. Cf. ch. V. on the omission of this title in Mk. 1;1; cf. later chs. on the Christology of Paul, Hebrews, and John, for interpretation of these terms.
69. 1:1-4. 70. 4:1, 14, 18; 10:21; 11:13; 24:49.
71. Cf. ch. 2; 5:29, 32, etc. cf. Glass, ib. p. 10, 11: "Reflection on the facts handed down, personal experience of the living presence, the Holy Spirit guiding into fuller truth all these have led the early church to see in ampler and clearer proportion the Figure of their Lord."
72. I Pet. 1:12; Gal. 1:11 f.; I Cor. 7:40; I Jno. 2:20 ff.; Jno. 16:13 f.
73. For a discussion of "inspiration" as a psychological phenomenon, see Cutten, Psychology of the Phenomena of Christianity. ch. XXIV; cf. also Orr, Revelation and Inspiration, chs. VIII-X.
74. Cf. Pfleiderer, The Early Christian Conception of Christ, 7 ff., 152 ff. for an over-emphasis of the developmental idea; also Gardner, Evolution in Christian Doctrine, '18, chs. II and

IV. Cf. Robertson, The Christ of the Logia, 1924, for an apparent under-estimate of it.

75. The Spiritual Life, ch. III. esp. pp. 114 ff.

76. Coe, Psychology of Religion, ch. XI.

77. Lk. 1:1-4.

78. ib. 1:3b. 79. See ch. VII for his portrait and the process of producing it. 80. Cf. Bennett, A Philosophical Study of Mysticism, Jo. of Rel., July '24, 432 f.

81. Cf. Coe, Psy. of Rel. p. 190. 82. Cf. Campbell, Paul the Mystic, 1908.

83. ib. p. 191. 84. ib. p. 201. 85. ib. p. 191.

86. Gal. 2:20. 87. Phil. 3:12.

88. Cf. ch. IX of this monograph, for a discussion of the external influences. 89. 10:19, 20.

90. Cf. 2:3 (tradition) with 8:2 and 9:24 (Greek thought-form.)

91. Cf. the phrasing of the preface, 1:1-3.

92. Cf. art. by Kautzsch, The Religion of Israel, HDB, V. 609 ff; art, by Fairweather, Development of Doctrine, HDB, V. 297 ff.

93. 1:14. 94. However, cf. Barton, art. Some Influence of Apollos in the N. T., Jo. Bib. Lit. Pts. I and II. '24; pp. 207 ff., for supposed Greek influence on the Virgin birth accounts of Mt. and Lk. Cf. art. Religion of Greece, HRE.

95. ib. p. 37 f.

96. Psy. of Rel., p. 273 f.

97. Cf. Coe, ib. 281 f. for a good description of "the religious inspirations" of the mystic.

98. Cf. Stratton, Psychology of the Religious Life, pp. 290 ff. 311 f, for a discussion of the "conviction that God could actually be revealed in human form, in Jesus Christ," who also becomes "mediator." Cf. also Pratt, The Religious Consciousness; for a sane discussion of the vital element in John's mysticism, cf. Watson, The Mysticism of St. John's Gospel, '16; for a very recent disscusion of Mysticism cf. Dean Inge, Idealism and Mysticism, '24,---champions a mysticism (Pauline and Johannine) which has a "basis of rationalism or intellectualism, though it culminates in revelation."

PART II

THE PROCESS OF CHRISTOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT

CHAPTER IV

THE EARLIEST PICTURE OF JESUS THE CHRIST

Having agreed upon the literary sources; having sketched the historical background in the messianic hope of the Jews and a kindred hope in the pagan religions; and having discussed the psychological principles involved in the evolution of New Testament Christology, we now take up the task of tracing the origin and development of this Christology. We start with the document called the Logia by Papias which was relegated to the waste-basket after it had been incorporated into Mark, Matthew, and Luke. The Logia was only a fragmentary document, while the Synoptic Gospels were early recognized as valuable records of the life and teachings of Jesus; yea, as authoritative Scripture.[2]

1. *The Earliest Christian Document.* Although Wellhsausen[3] and Jülicher[4] place Q later than Mark, the former actually predicating Mark as a source of Q, most scholars, liberal and conservative, think of the Logia, or Q, as the oldest Christian document. Ramsay[5] and Salmon[6] think it was written durink the lifetime of Jesus; that is, before 29 or 30. Robertson[7] is inclined to this very early date. Harnack,[8] in his scholarly and valuable literary effort to reproduce the Logia, is of the same opinion, especially as to the "source" of Q which the compiler of Q used.[9] Bacon[10] and Streeter[11] likewise place Q before Mark, the latter at least "twenty years."

2. *The Content of the Logia.* Since the document is not extant and its reproduction is colored by the subjective views of critics it is impossible to present a fixed document with hard and fast limits. Moffatt[12] tabulates the contents of Q as reproduced by sixteen New Testament scholars,[13] but no two of them are in exact accord in all details. There is a practical

agreement that Q includes passages not in Mark which are common to Matthew and Luke.[14] Most scholars agree that it includes a few events in addition to sayings of Jesus.[15]

For our study of the Christ-picture in the Logia, we may include, with reasonable certainty, the following sections in Matthew (with parallels in Luke): (1) The preaching of the Baptist;[16] (2) the baptism and temptation of Jesus;[17] (3) the beatitudes and other principles of the ideal life or reign of God in and among men;[18] (4) the centurion's faith and the terms of discipleship;[19] (5) annunciation of the good news of the Kingdom;[20] (6) the Son revealing the Father;[21] (7) Jesus answering the calumnies of the Pharisees;[22] (8) parables of the Kingdom;[23] (9) humility and forgiveness in the members of the Kingdom;[24] (10) denunciation of hypocrisy and the spirit of legalism;[25] (11) the coming of the King;[26] (12) possibly, though not probably, a few sayings on the death and resurrection of Jesus.

As to section (1), half of the sixteen scholars named above include it.[27] As to (2), nearly all include it.[28] As to (3)-(5), practically all include them; most include (6);[29] most include (8) and (10); [30] almost all assent to (9) and (11); none of the sixteen include (12)[31] but all think the primitive Christian document closed with more or less reference to the last times and the last things.

3. *The Earliest Picture of Jesus the Christ.* This is admitted by nearly all the critics. Harnack speaks of the Christ-picture in Q as a "historical fact."[32] Bacon[33] thinks it is our only refuge for finding the original Jesus, since the Markan, Matthean, and Lukan Christs are colored with "Paulinism." Robertson[34] agrees that Q presents the oldest picture of Christ. So do Ramsay, Salmon, Streeter, Allen,[35] Garvie,[36] and others.

(1) *Q not Influenced by Paul.* Whatever the more radical critics may say[37] about the presence of Paulinism in the Gospel of Mark, it is impossible to predicate a particle of Paulinism in Q. This earliest Christian document was likely composed before the conversion of Paul; if not, long before his influence could have been felt on the early Christology.[38] Harnack[39] writes: "The influence of 'Paulinism', which is so strong in St. Mark, is entirely wanting."

(2) *Q Apostolic in Authorship.* Bacon correctly asserts,[40] "That earliest element of the Synoptic tradition, Q, is the one

source generally acknowledged by both the most ancient and the most modern inquiry to be truly apostolic in authorship and historical in intuition."[41]

(3) *Sources of Q.* If Matthew the Apostle, as is almost universally admitted, composed the Logia,[42] he was himself an eye-and-ear witness to most of the sayings and events recorded therein. For the early material dealing with the period prior to his apostolic appointment (the preaching of the Baptist and the baptism and temptation of Jesus) he could easily have received it from reliable eye-and ear-witnesses. So the picture we have of Jesus in Q is a direct and primitive picture of the historical Jesus as He impressed Himself upon Matthew and other trusting, trustworthy companions. No "theologizing" or "dogmatizing" had, as yet, set in. Q is the "original" picture of the historical Jesus. As Robertson puts it:[43] "It is certain that in Q we have the earliest picture of Jesus that has been preserved to us."

4. *The Main Features of the Picture.* This original picture of the historical Jesus has few and simple features.

(1) *Jesus the Son of Man.* In the above included sections of Matthew and Luke this title, applied by Jesus to Himself, but never by others, occurs sixteen times, four[44] in connection with the picture of His humiliation and twelve[45] in scenes of His eschatological glory and power.

Surely the title presents Him as an actual man. Yet, there are few touches of His actual humanity in Q. The theory of Lietzmann,[46] N. Schmidt,[47] and Wellhausen,[48] that the term is equivalent to "man," finds little proof in Q. However, He is poor like most men and has not where to lay His head.[49] He wonders at great faith and is limited in knowledge of the future.[50]

It presents Him as the ideal or Representative Man. This meaning of the term is not as prominent in Q as in Mark, but is implied in His career of healing the sick and cleansing the lepers,[51] as also in the high ethical standard set by Him in the sermon on the mount, which He first lives, then preaches.[52]

Is the title Messianic? Harnack[53] and Robertson[54] positively assert that Jesus used the term in the messianic sense. "In Q this term can mean nothing else than the Messiah."[55] Not all modern scholars accept the term as a self-designation of Jesus, or as a messianic title,[56] but the great majority do.[57]

If the title was used by Jesus and not invented later by the evangelists and put on His lips; if it was intended by Jesus to express His own messianic consciousness but to veil it to the crowds clamoring for a political messiah, none could be better situated than Matthew to know it.

(2) *The Son of God.* There are only three sections in which the title occurs, in the baptism and temptation of Jesus, and in the "Johannine" passage,[58] called by Hase an "aerolite from the Johannine heaven."

Before inquiring what the title means in Q, let us give a historical resumé of the use of the term.[59] In the Old and New Testaments and in the Graeco-Roman world the term was used to designate (a) the angels;[60] (b) Israel as object of Jehovah's special love (Ex. 4:22, Hos. 13:1); (c) the theocratic King;[61] (d) the Messiah as an object of Divine love and with a Divine appointment to a superhuman task;[62] (e) Adam as a special creation of God;[63] (f) by Graeco-Roman writers to denote any extraordinary hero, warrior or king, as Marduk, Alexander, Augustus, et al;[64] (g) a little later by Paul and the author of Hebrews to designate Christians;[65] (h) by Q, Mark, Matthew, Luke, Paul, Hebrews, and John as a christological title of Jesus.

We now proceed to study the term in Q. What did the Father's voice out of the heavens intend to say to Jesus, when, at His baptism, it uttered those cheering, reassuring words, "This is my Beloved Son in whom I am well pleased?"[66] Although Harnack seeks to depreciate Q's picture of the "Personality of our Lord," by supposing there must be an "original Q," "the source" from which the compiler of Q derived his picture of Christ, yet he emphatically asserts,[67] "The 'christology' of the source, as the compiler understood it, presents a simple and consistent picture. The compiler of Q could not imagine otherwise than that Jesus was the Messiah, consecrated as Son of God at the baptism." But in what sense did Q think the Father's voice at the baptism was marking Him off as Son of God? Let Harnack speak again:[68] "Q probably proceeded to narrate the baptism of our Lord, together with the descent of the Spirit and the voice from heaven, by which He was marked off as Son of God (the Messiah) in the sense of Ps. II. 7." That is, according to Harnack, the voice from heaven designates Jesus Son of God only in the strictly mes-

sianic sense. "This is my Beloved Messiah, and I am well pleased with this act of consecration to the holy office to which I have appointed Him."[69]

On the other hand, many writers of New Testament Theology[70] and most of the exegetes,[71] think the term here, as elsewhere in the Synoptic Gospels, emphasizes the "personal relationship" between the Father and the Son. For three reasons we are inclined to take a mediating view, namely, that the term emphasizes above all else the messianic relation of Jesus to the Father, but at the same time implies the "personal" relation of the Messiah to the Father. Our reasons for regarding as primary the messianic significance of the term at the baptism and the "personal relationship" an implication, are historical in character: (a) Because of its general theocratic and messianic significance in Jewish literature; (b) because the context, the baptism and temptation of Jesus, is dealing primarily with the dedication of Jesus to and His preparation for the messianic office; (c) but especially because the early disciples were slow to understand the person of Jesus,[72] and because scarcely any "theologizing" about His person was practiced prior to Paul's great epistles.[73]

The same conclusion is the natural one when, in the temptations, the devil says to Jesus, "If thou art the Son of God."[74] In Q itself, it is likely that the temptation account followed closely upon the account of the baptism of Jesus. The voice from heaven had just assured Jesus, while dedicating Himself to the superhuman task of the Messiah, that He is the Messiah and that the Heavenly Father, who appointed Him to this position, endorses and smiles upon this act. Immediately, the devil subjects Him to the most acute tests of His messianic consciousness, purpose, and methods. Jesus is tempted to use His messianic power for His own comfort, to make a spectacular display of that power, and thus presume on the protecting care of the Father, and to take the "short-cut" to the messianic throne. The devil cared nothing for the unique personal relation of Christ to God, but he was anxious about this cheering approval from the Father, especially about what He might do with His messianic power, and about the methods to be adopted by Him to realize His messianic dream.[75]

But the christological gem of Q, a classic in New Testament Christology, is the statement of Matthew 11:27 (parallel, Lk.

10:22). Harnack undoubtedly understates the meaning of the language when he writes:[76] "He says nothing about an 'eternal' relationship between the Father and the Son, but simply expresses an historical fact"; "It forms the climax of our Lord's self-revelation, and yet it does not assert more than that He had been permitted to bring to the simple ones the knowledge of God." Bacon stresses the 'ethical sense" of the term.[77] "Jesus felt Himself to be the Son of God only as He felt Himself to be the Leader and Champion of His disciples who in an ethical sense are themselves sons of God." Robertson,[78] on the other hand, does not seek to show in what sense the term Son is used in this "Johannine passage"; but merely asserts, as to Harnack's interpretation, "This is a rather easy way to empty language of its obvious meaning. The fact that Jesus claimed to be the Son of God and is so called in Q is beyond dispute." But what is the "obvious meaning"? Harnack undertook to tell us but, possibly, "emptied the language"; Robertson seeks not to explain but speaks of "the implication of the deity of the Son." The following observations are self-evident: (a) Jesus claims an unique, yea, complete,[79] knowledge of the Father, which implies, but does not assert, an unique personal relationship to the Father. Jesus is not 'theologizing" but declaring a "historical fact." Yet, the "implication" is evident, that He is claiming a superhuman knowledge on the ground of an unique relation.[80] (b) The Son, because of His complete knowledge of the Father, is divinely appointed to make the Father "known to whomsoever He wills." He has an authority that is grounded in knowledge. His messianic station is not arbitrary or honorary but is in harmony with historical facts; yea, with the Son's personal superhuman knowledge of the Father.

(c) On this personal knowledge of God and its logical sequence, authority to reveal the Father, Jesus claims the right to summon men, who need to know God's love and care and forgiveness, to matriculate in His school. "Take my yoke and learn of me."[81]

(d) This classic in Q may easily, as claimed by Feine,[82] furnish the stepping stone from Jesus to Paul. Although neither Jesus nor the writer of Q is "theologizing" about the person of the Son,[83] incidentally there falls from the lips of Jesus a statement which expresses His filial consciousness, and the

writer of Q has put it on record in the morning twilight of Christian literature long before Paul, or any other Christology makers, could have tampered with it.

(3) *Jesus the Messiah.* The title Son of man meant more than Messiah. So did the title Son of God; but both titles as they occur in Q emphatically point out Jesus as the Messiah, each emphasizing certain traits of the messianic character. But Jesus, although only seldom in Q called the Christ or Christ,[84] in every title and reference is presented as the Messiah.

(a) *The Teaching Messiah.* The fact that this oldest Christian document is called Logia (sayings) emphasizes the prophetic character of the Christ of Q. He is the "sayer," the teacher. He gave to the world the beatitudes[85] and the Golden Rule,[86] the sermon on the mount[87] and the sermon in the plain, the parables of the Kingdom[88] and the principles of fellowship among the members of the Kingdom,[89] the denunciation of hypocrisy and the announcement of the judgment.[90] He taught with a consummate certainty and a Divine authority. "It hath been said by them of old time—but *I* say unto you."[91] This is surely the "language of arrogance," "unless He was what He claimed to be."[92] His teaching was in the realm of morals and religion. His conceptions of ethics are "bound up with His conception of God." "Morality, to Jesus, is an ethical mysticism."[93]

(b) *The Wonder-working Messiah.* This is not so prominent in Q as in Mark, but it is present. Harnack[94] thinks that the reply of Jesus to the Baptist,[95] "Go and show John," etc. "is the most important passage in Q concerning the personality of our Lord, because here Jesus appeals to His works in proof of His Messiaship."

(c) *The Royal and Eschatological Messiah.* While the ethical or teaching messiahip is more prominent in Q,[96] on the other hand, the royal and eschatological messiaship is also conspicuous. "The Son of man shall come in His glory,"[97] separate the righteous and the wicked, and be acclaimed "Lord."[98] It is to be observed that the teaching function of the Messiah is much more prominent in Q than is the eschatological. The author of Q does not seek to explain the relation of the ethical and eschatological elements to each other. He merely records the facts, and thus rudely paints the functions of the teaching

and the royal Messiah, who at last functions as the Arbiter of human destinies.

(d) But is He the suffering, redeeming Messiah? Harnack says no[99]; Bacon says yes probably,[100] while Streeter[101] correctly calls it "guessing." The announcements of His death are in Mark; also the ransom and blood-covenant passages, so it is nothing more than a "guess" to say that Q presents the picture of the saving Messiah. If Streeter is correct in supposing[102] Luke 9:51-15:10 might be a "block" from Q, we have the picture of Jesus "receiving sinners" and acting the Shepherd in search for the lost sheep. But there is no good reason to believe that Q has painted Jesus as the suffering, redeeming Messiah. In this original picture He is the Son with perfect knowledge of the Father and because of this He is sent as Messiah to be the prophet of the Kingdom and finally the Judge and King.

..6 *Resumé as to the Character of the Earliest Picture of Christ:*—(1) It is a simple memorandum of the chief teachings of Jesus. The writer's primary interest is in the teachings and not the person of Christ. (2) Co-ordinate with this interest in the teachings of Jesus is the author's interest in the messianic office. All His teachings and other activities and whatever titles are ascribed to Jesus, above all things else, accentuate and demonstrate His messiahship.[103] (3) But all unconsciously, and all the more faithfully to the facts, the author of Q has given the world the first pen-picture of the person of Jesus the Christ; a picture of Him which includes His real and ideal humanity, His real and unique divinity. (4) It is an amateur's pen-picture with no embellishments of the literary artist; so all the more trustworthy as a real picture, as far as it goes, of the original Jesus.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

1. HE. III. 39. 2. Cf. Westcott, Hist. of the Canon of N. T., 1896; Souter, Text and Canon of N. T., 1913; von Soden, Urchr. Litt., 1905.

3. Einl. in d. drei Evangelien, 1905. 4. Einl. 1906. 5. Expos. May, '07. 6. Human Element in the Gospels, p. 274.

7. The Christ of the Logia, 1924, p. 18. 8. The Sayings of Jesus, 1909.

9. ib. 241, 243 f. 10. Hibert Journal Supplement, 1909, p. 216.

11. Oxford Studies in Syn. Prob., 1911, p. 185, 219 ff. Cf. H. J. Fowler, art. Paul, Q, and the Jerusalem Church, Jo. Bib. Lit. Pts. I and II. '24, pp. 9 ff., for a somewhat later date, but "certainly before the outbreak of the war in 66."

12. ibid. pp. 197-202. 13. Reville, Barnes, Burton, Wernle, von Soden, Stanton, Barth, Allen, O. Holtzmann, Harnack, Wellhausen, Roehrich, Wendt, Hawkins, B. and J. Weiss.

14. Cf. Harnack, Sayings of Jesus, p. XIV. 15. Cf. Allen, ICC, Oxford Studies, pp. 235 ff.

16. 3:7-12. 17. 3:14-4:11. 18. 5:3-7:27. (excepting comments and connections by author.)

19. 8:5-10, 13, 19-22. 20. 9:37-10:42. 21. 11:25-30.

22. 12:25-45.

23. Chs. 13, 22.

24. Ch. 18. 25. Ch. 23. 26. Chs. 24 and 25. Of course, there are some additions in all these chapters by the author of the Gospel.

27. Wernle, Stanton, Barth, Holtzmann, Harnack, Wellhausen, include it.

28. Reville, Barnes, von Soden, Allen do not, and Harnack hesitates.

29. But not Burton in toto. 30. Harnack used much of both; Wendt not much of either.

31. But Streeter, Oxford Studies, 185 ff. thinks it possible; so does Bacon, Hib. Jour. Sup. '09, 216; Robertson, ibid, p. 24, thinks it probable.

32. ibid. p. 227; on the other hand, cf. Pfleiderer, Das Christusbild. d. Urchr. Glaubens, '03, s. 40f; The Early Christian Conception of Christ, '05, p. 10; Urc., ZW. Aufl. '02, s. 31, who contends that "the original historical picture of Jesus is unattainable."

33. Hib. Jour. Sup. '09, pp. 214 ff.

34. The Christ of the Logia, pp. 18, 37, etc.

35. Cf. titles for these four.

36. Apologetics, pp. 100 ff.

37. Schmiedel, Neumann, Wrede, Wendling, J. Weiss, Lagrange, Bacon, and others.

38. So Bacon, ibid above, admits; however, Piepenbring, Jesus Historique, 1909, pp. 15-71, thinks not only Mk. but even Q is "influenced by Pauline Theology."

39. ibid. p. 248.

40. ibid. p. 216. 41. Cf. also Peake, ibid. p. 122; Moffat, ibid. p. 203; Harnack, ibid. p. XIV. calls it "relatively original."

42. Cf. ch. I. on trustworthiness of Synoptic sources.

43. ibid. p. 40. 44. 8:20, 12:40, 13:37, 18:11.

45. 10:23; 12:32; 13:4; 24:27, 30, 36, 37, 39, 44; 25:31, 64.

46. Der Menschensohn, 1896. 47. The Prophet of Nazareth, 1905.

48. Einl. '05; cf. art. Son of Man by Stalker, Int. St. Bib. Enc. Cf. Jackson and Lake, Beginnings of Christianity, Pt. I. vol. I.

374ff. who say the title refers to Jesus "as a man, to His Parusia, and His Passion," but think the New Testament use is largely due to the later interpretation of the disciples.

49. 8:20. 50. 8:10; 24:36.

51. Mt. 11:4, Lk. 7:22. 52. Cf. esp. the Golden Rule, Mt. 7:12 =-Lk. 6:36.

53. Ibid. p. 238. 54. ibid. p. 32. 55. ibid. p. 238.

56. See Chap. V on its use in Mark for the different views of modern scholars, Schmiedel, Wrede, J. Weiss, N. Schmidt, Stanton, Patton, et al.

57. Most exegetes, Meyer, Mt., Mk.; Bruce, EGT.; Gould, ICC; Plummer, Mt.; Robertson, Mt. in BHS; McNeile, Mt.; Swete, Mk.; most writers of N. T. Th., Holtzmann, Beyschlag, Weiss, Bovon, Stevens, Sheldon, Weinel, Feine, Moffatt, Theology of the Gospels.

58. Mt. 11:27=Lk. 10:22; for recent views, cf. Vannutelli, Il Figlio dell' Uomo, etc.; Peake, The Messiah and the Son of Man, the former denying, (following Wrede and Wellhausen) the latter asserting the messianic significance of the title. Cf. also Scott, The Kingdom and the Messiah, ch. VI, who thinks it messianic.

59. See Schürer, Hist. of the Jewish People, ib. 140ff; Charles, Eschatology, Hebrew, Jewish, and Christian, 1913; Bousset, Jesus, 1906; Sanday, art. Son of God, HDB; Stalker, art. Son of God, Int. St. Bib. Enc.

60. Job. 1:6; 2:1; 38:7. 61. Ps. 2:7. 62. Enoch 105:2; 4 Es. 7:28, 29; in Ps. Sol. 17:26, the term not used clearly reflects Ps. 2:7; see ch. II for other references to Beloved and Beloved Son in later Jewish lit.

63. Lk. 3:38. 64. Cf. Pfleiderer, Early Chr. Conception of Christ, pp. 33ff. Cf. Deissmann, Bib. Studies, p. 131, for use of Υἱὸς Θεοῦ in an inscription of Cos and in a Fayum Papyrus as a title of Augustus.

65. Rom. 8:14; Heb. 2:10.

66 Mt. 3:17=Lk. 3:22.

67. ib. p. 243 f. 68. ib. p. 235.

69. So agree Bousset, J. Weiss, Wrede, Allen, ICC, et al.; cf. esp. Jackson and Lake, ib. I. I. 395 for view not much in advance of its messianic significance.

70. Wendt, Weiss, Stevens, Sheldon, Estes, Gould, Adeney.

71. Broadus, Meyer, Bruce (EGT) McNeile, Robertson, Com. and The Christ of the Logia, pp. 28 ff.; Plummer, et al.

72. Cf. Mk. 8:31, "Thou art the Christ"; no hint at a "unique sonship," as shown by Lk's. parallel, 9:20, which proves that in Matthew the title, "the Son of the living God," is primarily messianic in meaning. Cf. Acts 1-12, for the absence of the title to express the faith of the early church.

73. Written about 55-58—at least 15 to 20 years after Q.

74. Cf. Robertson, Gram. of the Grk. N. T., pp. 915, 781, for correct emphasis (by use of indicative) on the devil's recogni-

tion of the "fact" of Jesus' sonship; also, The Christ of the Logia, p. 29.

75. For moderately liberal views of the term, cf. O. Holtzmann, Leben Jesu, '01; Bruce, EGT; Allen, ICC; Burton and Mathews, Life of Jesus, p. 29f. For ultra-conservative views of the term as used by the devil, cf. Plummer, McNeile, Robertson, Coms. on Mt.; Stalker, art Son of God, Int. Stan. Bib. Enc.; Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus, I.

76. ibid. 219. 77. Jesus the Son of God, p. 28f.

78. ibid. p. 31. 79. Greek, ἐπιγινώσκει.

80. So Meyer, Com. ad loc.; also Bruce, Plummer, McNeile, Robertson, et al.

81. For the school idea in the term "yoke" cf. Broadus, Meyer, Allen, Robertson (com.); also the author's Function of Teaching in Christianity, 1913, chap. I. For the inclusion of vv, 28-30 in Q the critics are not unanimous. Cf. Moffat, INT. 197ff.

82. Theologie des Neue Testament, 1910, s. 48 ff. Cf. further Feine's view in chap. VI, f. n.

83. Of course, Schumacher has overstated it when he speaks, in his Die Selbstoffenbarung Jesu bei Mat. 11:27, '12, s. 134, 141, of "metaphysical fellowship of Being," and "the essence of the Father and the Son is the same."

84. Mt. 23:10; 24:5, 23. 85. Mt. 5:3-12. 86. Mt. 7:12. 87. Chs. 5-7, Lk. 6:20-48.

88. Chap. 13, parallels in Lk. 89. Chap. 18.

90. Chaps. 22, 24-25. 91. Mt. 5:2:22, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 38, 39, etc.

92. So Robertson, ibid. p. 34; and so Bacon, Hib. Jour. Sup. '09, p. 216, who calls Jesus "the ideal scribe of the Kingdom of heaven."

93. So Scott, The Ethical Teaching of Jesus, 1924.

94. ibid. p. 239.

95. Mt. 11: 4-6.

96. Schweitzer, Bousset, and at times Harnack, p. 246, to the contrary.

97. Mt. 24:31. 98. Mt. 25:32 ff. 99. ibid. p. 246.

100. Hib. Jour. Sup. '09, p. 216; so Robertson, ibid.

101. Oxford Studies, pp. 185 ff. 102. ibid.

103. Yet, it must be remembered that Matthew is not apologetic in the Logia; that, as Harnack (ib. p. 241) says, "Q's aims are not those of apologetic Christology."

CHAPTER V

A "SNAP-SHOT" OF JESUS THE SON

The story of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark impresses the average intelligent reader as a simple, honest account of a historical character. Most scholars have not been convinced that Schmiedel[1] is correct in supposing that "only nine genuine sayings of Jesus" concerning *Himself* are to be found in Mark's Gospel; that these belong to the "original Mark," and that a later Redactor has put all the rest of the sayings in the mouth of Jesus and colored both them and His deeds with later "dogmatic" teachings. The critical world, to say nothing of the world of earnest, practical Christians, has judged Wrede as rather fanciful in his conclusions[2] that only the "original Mark" gives "the real history of Jesus," that the later Mark writes from the "standpoint of the risen Messiah and designated Christ," and that his account really "belongs to the history of dogma." More fanciful still have been judged the conclusions of E. Wendling[3] who allows his "Mark *number one*" to give us an essentially "historical groundwork," but asserts that "Mark number two" produces "a poetic expansion of Mark number one"; while "Mark number three" is only "a Redactor" who "dogmatizes" by calling Jesus the Son of Man, the Messiah, and the Son of God. To most scholars of today the conclusion of B. W. Bacon[4] that Mark, as it comes from the hand of the Redactor, a "radical Paulinist," is a "strong reflection of Paulinism," and was written in the interests of the Pauline theology championed by the church in Rome, is, to say the least of it, unverifiable and incredible.[5] As Professor Robertson pointedly says,[6] "It has met with a poor reception from the modern scholars." There is no reason to believe that an "apologetic Redactor" has lugged in a mass of Pauline theological lumber to cover up the historical Jesus, the Jesus of the "Ur-Marcus," the Jesus of the genuine "Petrine" tradition.[7]

1 *A Simple Snap-Shot of Jesus.* The Christ-picture of Mark's Gospel is scarcely worthy to be called a Christology—

"a doctrine or theory of the person of Christ."[8] The author is telling a story in simplicity and earnestness, the story of Jesus' wonderful life. He is not a literary artist.[9] He is an honest story teller who is trying to picture vividly before the minds of his readers the career of Jesus, who has impressed Peter and other early followers that He is the Messiah, the authoritative Teacher, and the Son of God. As Maurice Jones puts it; "The superiority of St. Matthew and St. Luke to St. Mark is that of a portrait by Rembrandt to a mechanical snap-shot."[10] Mark is no Rembrandt who causes his subject to pose for a perfect painting, but an amateur with his kodak who takes for all succeeding ages a "snap-shot" of the historical Jesus. The author of the Fourth Gospel, not so much Matthew and Luke, is the spiritual Rembrandt who paints the portrait of the eternal Logos and the transcendent Son of God. Of course, as claimed by J. Weiss, Wrede, Lagrange, Wendling, and Bacon, there is an apologetic element in the Gospel of Mark, not so striking, however, as it is in the Gospel of John. The Gospel of John is decidedly apologetic; the Gospel of Mark is historical in spirit. However, Mark is not an equipped historian, as Luke is; he loves the truth and the facts about Jesus and sets out to tell them as an unsophisticated child, or an honest, uncultured rustic, would.

2 *Is the Christ of Mark the Historical Jesus?* The subjective element in the narration of historical facts and in reporting the sayings of others is not to be ignored, but undoubtedly Professor Bacon has stressed it too much in the case of Mark, a simple, honest narrator of facts and events.[11] "The *motive* is never strictly historical but always aetiological and frequently apologetic . . . The evangelic tradition consists of so and so many anecdotes, told and retold for the purpose of explaining or defending beliefs and practices of the contemporary church."[12] But, because an honest teller of facts has a good "purpose" and "motive" in telling those facts, does he necessarily and inevitably pervert or misrepresent those facts to "carry his point?" No honest man, with a noble religious ideal as that which characterized the early Christians, could wilfully pervert or misrepresent the facts.[13] So, after making a *small allowance* for the "human element"[14] in the transmission of the Gospel story, we must not only concede with Pfleiderer[15] that "this oldest evangelist furnishes the truest impression which

Jesus made on His environment," but that it is the nearest extant approach to the actual historical Jesus attainable through a human narrator.[16]

Yet, it is not only not the complete Christ of the New Testament whose portrait is rudely drawn in Mark, and not only not the perfectly balanced Christ of John (and especially of the Nicene Creed), but is likely not the exact picture of the real, many-sided Jesus who lived and taught and healed and wrought in Galilee, Perea, and Jerusalem. Mark is only a "snap-shot" picture of the historical Jesus. It has "caught" many features of His Divine-human person and a few phases of His healing, saving mission, but it is not a complete photograph of the real Jesus. It is only one man's rudely drawn character-sketch of the historical Jesus; howbeit, a sketch by an honest, truthful man, illumined by the Divine Spirit to grasp the facts and to interpret the truths in the light of reality. Let us study the main features of the Markan sketch.

3 *Jesus the Son of Man.* Although the introduction presents Jesus as the Son of God,[17] the Beloved Son, the usual title preferred by Jesus Himself, though never on the lips of others, is "the Son of Man." This title occurs in Mark fourteen times, ten in connection with His life of service which ends in death,[18] and four referring to His exaltation.[19] What does this title mean? Did Jesus apply it to Himself, or did Mark put it on His lips?[20] There is no good reason not to accept the title as a self-designation of Jesus to express his consciousness of being a real man, the ideal man, but also the Messiah.

(1) *Jesus a Real Man.* Jesus knew Himself to be a real man and Mark is doubtless emphasizing for his readers the real humanity of Jesus. He is under the limitations of a real man, and so must "sleep[21]; must inquire as to the number of loaves the disciples have[22]; is represented as a natural descendant of David[23]; is surprised at unbelief[24]; is angry with the crowd[25]; in the garden shrinks from the tragic death of Calvary,[26] and does not know the day or hour of His own Parousia.[27] But we must not conclude that Mark means to say, He was only an ordinary man.[28]

(2) *Jesus the Ideal Man.* While we cannot do full justice to the title if we limit its meaning to Jesus the ideal man,[29] undoubtedly Jesus thinks of Himself as the representative man and Mark sketches Him as the model man. He pictures as

shining forth in His character the highest qualities to which any man may attain,[30] sympathy for the suffering,[31] patience for the plodders,[32] love for all,[33] and the spirit of sacrificial service.[34] Mark means to say, all men should follow Jesus as the model man and live the life of compassion and love, of service and sacrifice.

(3) *Is it a Messianic Title?* Although some scholars do not think Jesus used the term at all and although others do not think the disciples used it to designate Him as the Messiah, most liberal scholars, as well as practically all conservatives, are convinced that Jesus used the term in the messianic sense.[35] As the Son of Man He is Lord of the Sabbath and of David, and has authority to forgive sins[36]; He is the suffering Messiah[37]; He gives His life as a ransom for many[38]; yet as the Son of Man He is the triumphant Messiah who rises from the dead[39]; who will come again "in the glory of His Father," "with great power and glory," and will finally take His seat "at the right hand of power."[40]

4 *Jesus the Son of God.* Not only is Jesus called the Son of Man by Mark but also the Son of God, and sometimes in the same sentence or context.[41] He shall come (at the Parousia) as the Son of Man, but He will come also in the glory of His Father (God). As the Son of Man he does not know the day or the hour of His coming, but at the same time He calls Himself "the Son" in antithesis with (God) "the Father." While answering affirmatively the high priest's question, "Art thou the Son of the Blessed?" in the same breath He refers to the future coming of the Son of Man.

(1) *Are the two terms synonymous?* Is Jesus the Son of God in the same sense in which Luke calls Adam the Son of God?[42] Is He Son of God in the same sense in which Paul and Hebrews and John afterwards call Christians sons of God?[43] Surely Jesus is the Son of God in a higher sense than that in which any man may claim the title.

(2) *Is it a messianic title?* It is so used in the Psalms. "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee,"[44] referring to the theocratic king and pointing forward to the Messiah. Is Mark using it in this sense?[45] At the baptism of Jesus the Father is represented as speaking out of the heavens,[46] "Thou art my Beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased." Jesus is in the act of dedicating Himself to His messianic ca-

reer, the Father approves the act, and assures Him that He *is* His "Beloved Son." How far is Mark looking beyond the messianic significance of the term, "Beloved Son"?[47] On the mount of transfiguration again the voice from heaven speaks to Jesus,[48] "This is my Beloved Son: hear ye Him." It must be observed that Mark places the transfiguration, in his Gospel, immediately after Jesus had elicited from the disciples the protestation of faith in Him as the Messiah—"Thou art the Christ"[49]—and after His definite announcement to them of His death. The first assurance of the Father's approval of His messianic career was at the opening of His campaign in Galilee, the second was at the climax of His ministry in Galilee, the climax being at the same time the crisis which marked the beginning of the end. Whatever else the title may have meant to Mark, it surely included the messianic[50] significance.

(3) *Did He use it in an ethical sense?* That is, did Mark think of the term "son" as used in its regular Jewish sense,[51] to denote ethical likeness?[52] Did Jesus think of His relationship to the Father as only one of special love by the Father because of his moral likeness to the Father?[53] In this statement, although putting a limitation upon His knowledge of future events (His Parousia) yet He claims a unique filial consciousness in that memorable Johannine antithesis, "the Son," "the Father." It must be noted, however, that Mark contains not a single saying of Jesus like Matthew 11:27 or Luke 10:22 to emphasize the intimacy of the unique relation between the Father and the Son. The divine Sonship of Jesus in Mark moves chiefly in the sphere of His official activities in founding the kingdom, healing, overcoming the evil spirits, teaching the elevated principles of the Kingdom, forgiving sins, and coming in glory at the Parousia to be the judge. But it is perfectly clear that this title means more to Mark than an official, ethical Sonship. He is likely thinking of the messianic function as grounded in a personal relationship of the Son to the Father.

(4) *Is the Deity of Christ made prominent in Mark?* Robertson[54] writes a chapter on "The Deity of Christ in the Gospel of Mark." Several times in his discussion of the Christ-sketch in Mark he emphasizes the "deity" of Christ. "Certainly Mark puts Christ in the light of making a claim of deity by this act" (forgiving the sins of the paralytic) "and by His words of defense."[55] Again he says, "The truth is, that the whole tone

of Mark's Gospel, the earliest of the Gospels, is precisely that of the other Gospels and of the rest of the New Testament."[56] While Robertson is making this claim for Mark's Christ, Pfleiderer[57] and Bacon[58] claim that Mark has an "apologetic purpose," that is, the definite aim to present "the Christ of Pauline theology," and according to the former,[59] to "unite the Jesus of the Palestinian tradition, the energetic hero of the Jewish reform movement, with the Christ of the Pauline theology, the suffering hero of a mystical world-salvation." That is, the extremes of modern criticism, represented by Robertson the conservative and Pfleiderer and Bacon the liberals, both claim that Mark presents a Christ-picture in harmony with the Pauline Christ, the one to prove the essential agreement of the various Christ-pictures of the New Testament, the other to show that the Christ of Mark is not the real historical Jesus. How strange! What is the conclusion demanded by the facts of Mark's Gospel?

(1) Observe, Mark does not call Jesus "God" (Theos), as do Paul,[60] the author of Hebrews,[61] and John.[62] Nor does he ever call Him the "image" of God or speak of His containing "all the fullness of the Deity," as we find in the Pauline epistles.[63] Nor is there more than one Johannine antithesis between "the Father" and "the Son"[64] and that in a context which emphasizes the limitation of Christ's knowledge, such as never occurs in John. So, if Mark means "deity" by his title Son of God, either the former expression must be graded down to the level of mere divinity or the latter graded up to the level of real deity. In either case we are playing with christological terms.

(2) On the other hand, the hypothesis of the extreme liberals, Schmiedel, Wrede, Wendling, J. Weiss, Bacon, and others,[65] as to the dissection of Mark into three or four "hands," or strata, simple history, "incipient dogma," and "Pauline theology" by a "Redactor," cannot be proved with any degree of certainty. This is evident since no two liberals agree as to how to dissect Mark. So we must take the Christ-picture of Mark as one sketch, a harmonious picture, as suggested by Pfleiderer's word "united" above.[66] Yet, as claimed by Pfleiderer,[67] there is an "apologetic purpose" in Mark,[68] and he did write to unite into his one picture of Christ a variety of christological conceptions; at least, the Logian and the Petrine, and possibly

other slightly different varieties existing prior to Paul's leading publications.[69] But the whole atmosphere of Mark's Gospel is decidedly against the conclusion that he put into the term Son of God a metaphysical sense which includes essential deity.

5 *Jesus the Messiah.* The title, the Son of man, we have seen, is messianic, but it is more; it emphasizes the real and representative humanity of Jesus. The title, the Son of God, to Mark, includes the messianic office of Jesus, but much more; it accentuates His real and unique divinity, His likeness to and intimate personal relationship with the Father. But it is not in harmony with the characteristics of Mark as a simple story teller of the Wonder-working Jesus to suppose, for a moment, that he is even intimidating His essential deity, or metaphysical Sonship, as later taught by Paul, the author of Hebrews, and John. The main emphasis in Mark is upon Jesus as the unique Son of God who is at the same time the Wonder-working Son of man, the Messiah.

(1) *The Teaching Messiah.* Mark sketches Jesus in action as a Wonder-worker and a Teacher, all to prove His messiahship. Although only five parables find a place in Mark, no sermon on the mount, and no sermon in the plain, yet twelve times He is addressed or called the teacher.[70] He teaches in His wonder-works of healing, of mastery over nature, and of raising the dead. Observe how the term teacher is applied to Him in connection with His healings and other wonder-works.[71] He begins His Galilean ministry as the messenger of the Kingdom. "Repent and believe the gospel, for the Kingdom of God is at hand."[72] He sets forth the nature of the Kingdom, its growth, and the condition of entrance into it.[73] The Father is its King, loving service is its law; it is a spiritual, ethical Kingdom in process,[74] to be consummated when the Son of man shall "come in power and glory."[75]

(2) *The wonder-working Messiah.* Prominent in Mark is this feature of the messianic career. Power is the key word to Mark's Gospel. Jesus is Master of nature, because He masters diseases, demons, and death.[76] He heals a leper, a paralytic, Peter's mother-in-law, and even multitudes. He heals the worst form of demonic possession when He restores the Gadarene to his sanity and his loved ones. He resuscitates the daughter of Jairus whom all recognized to be really "dead." He stills

boisterous winds and waves and walks on the water; with five loaves and two fishes He feeds five thousand men, besides women and children. With His characteristic "straightway" (41 times) Mark describes the Son in action, moving in rapidity from scene to scene, as the wonder-working Messiah.

(3) *The royal or eschatological Messiah.* Although Schweitzer,[77] J. Weiss,[78] Bousset,[79] and others, fail to do justice to the present ethical kingdom, it must be noted that Jesus in the act of riding into Jerusalem on an ass, the symbol of royalty, proclaimed Himself the royal Messiah. Mark records His claim to realization of His royal messiahship in that He shall come "in power and great glory" to function as Judge and to pass upon men's eternal destinies.[80] This function of the Messiah is in perfect harmony with Mark's conception of His exalted Divine personality.

(4) *The suffering Messiah.* Only casually, in the early ministry is it hinted that the Son of man, as the bridegroom, must be taken away.[81] From Caesarea Philippi on[82] Jesus repeatedly told the disciples that He must "be put to death." Shortly after these announcements He set forth sacrificial service as the law of the Kingdom which is illustrated in Himself as the suffering Messiah who came "to serve and to give His life a ransom for many."[83] In connection with the supper, according to Mark, Jesus took the cup and said, "This is my blood of the covenant."[84] He could not mean less than to assert that His death is the sacrifice to ratify the covenant. He is to give His life "a ransom for many," in order to ratify the covenant of grace. Bacon[85] denies the "ransom" saying to Jesus, calling it an "immoral crudity" of the "Paulinist Redactor," but thinks Jesus actually (in the Petrine source) uttered the "blood-covenant" saying, and that it lays the foundation for the doctrine of "reconciliation" as found in Paul.[86] So it is practically universally claimed by the scholars that the suffering Messiah of Mark is the Redeemer through whom "reconciliation" is secured. The difference between the liberals and the conservatives is as to whether Jesus taught it or the "Paulinist Redactor."

It is to be noticed that Mark represents Jesus as thinking of His death as "vicarious suffering." It is to be "a ransom for many."[87] The idea of "vicarious suffering," not of the Mes-

siah but of one Jew for his fellows, was a fairly common Jewish teaching in the first century A. D.[88]

(5) *The risen Messiah.* If we close Mark at 16:8,[89] which at present the evidence favors, Mark puts his finishing touch upon his Christ-sketch by telling us "He is risen." He is the ever-living Christ. There can be little doubt that Mark is here reproducing the preaching of Peter who in the early chapters of Acts and in the First Epistle makes the resurrection of Jesus basic in his teachings.[90] Mark may or may not have heard from Paul that Jesus is "marked off as the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead."[91] Likely he was familiar with Matthew 11:27; that is, he could have received from the Logia the conception of Jesus as the unique Son of God. At any rate, he enforced and confirmed this exalted conception of "the Son" by closing his picture with the historical fact of the resurrection of Jesus, which he could have learned not only from Peter, but which he found to be universal in the early Christian tradition.

It is to be observed that Mark's relating the fact of Jesus' resurrection as the climax of his life-story of Him makes it evident that he did not regard the Son of man as only an ordinary man. He is the representative man; the builder of the Kingdom of God on earth; He is, therefore, the Son of God. His wonder-works in healing and saving men; in bringing the Kingdom to men by healing their bodies and minds so as to deliver them from the power of demons; in forgiving their sins and bringing them into "covenant" relation with the Father, all prove Him to be *"the Son."* On the other hand, we must not forget that Mark does not paint the pre-existent Christ, the eternal Son of God, and so has no conception of Him in a metaphysical relation to the Father.

6 *The Logian Christ-Picture and the Markan Christ-Sketch Compared.* (1) The Christ of the Logia is nearer to the real, historical Jesus. The Markan Christ is drawn at least twenty years later than the Logian Christ. The Christ of the Logia is a simple picture, that of Mark is a composite sketch. While Matthew is setting down "sayings" and a few events, as he heard and saw them, or as he received in a few instances directly from eye-witnesses, Mark is blending into one sketch of the Christ as worshipped by the early Christians the varying features of Q and Peter's preaching. There seems to be little dif-

ference in the original Logian and the Petrine pictures of Christ. But when Mark has finished the blending of the emphasized features in the two primitive Christ-pictures, the product is quite different from the simple, original picture of Christ in Q. (2) As to His person and office: the Christ of Q is emphatically the Messiah; the office is in the centre of the picture; the Christ of Mark is pre-eminently the Son of God who is also the Son of man, the Messiah. In Q the messiahship of Jesus is in the centre of the picture, and the Divine Sonship, in a unique sense, is a logical implication;[92] in Mark the unique Divine Sonship of Jesus is in the centre of the picture,[93] for it is the logical conclusion of His wonder-working messianic career. (3) As to the messianic office: in Q it is the picture of Jesus the Teacher which stands out prominently; in Mark it is the sketch of Jesus the Wonder-worker. In Q it is the eschatological or royal Messiah; in Mark it is the healing, redeeming Messiah, who meets our gaze at the centre of the picture. In Q He incidentally heals; in Mark He rather logically assumes the role of Judge, but this is not central in the picture. (4) The Logian Christ represents the first effort of an early Christian to draw the simple picture of the real Christ; the Markan Christ represents the first stage in the development of Christology; the first effort to blend into a composite, harmonious picture the various features of His person and task, blending the human and the Divine in the person of the Messiah, the activities of healing, serving, saving, redeeming, and reigning into a unified messianic career.

NOTES TO CHAPTER V

1. Art. Jesus in En. Bib.; also Mk.
2. Das Messiasgeheimnis, etc., 1901.
3. Ur-Marcus, 1905.
4. Jesus and Paul, esp. Ch. VI; Beginnings of the Gospel Story, etc.
5. Cf. also J. Weiss, ibid; A. Müller, Lagrange, Pfleiderer, Christian Origins, '06, p. 217-219 . . " Mk. guided by a decided apologetic purpose."
6. The Christ of the Logia, '24, p. 45.
7. Cf. again Ch. I. for the trustworthiness of Mark.
8. See Webster, New Internat. Dic. '22.
9. Cf. Robertson, A. Gram. of the Greek N. T., etc. p. 118 f.

10. Cf. The New Testament in the Twentieth Century, 1914.
11. Cf. H. E. III. 39, V. 8, 2-4, for statements by Papias and Irenaeus as to his "care not to omit anything that he had heard or to set down any false statements."
12. Bacon, Beginnings of the Gospel Story, p. 9.
13. Cf. chap. I., for Mark's trustworthy sources—Peter's preaching and Q, both apostolic and from eye-and ear-witnesses.
14. Cf. Salmon, The Human Element in the Gospels.
15. Chr. Origins, p. 217.
16. See Farmer, art. Mark, Gos. of, Int. St. Bib. Enc. for emphasis on the "historicity" of Mark.
17. I:1-13; for the omission of this title in I:1 by the oldest Mss., cf. Gould, ICC; Swete, The Gospel according to St. Mark; especially Bacon, ib., who admits the title ought to be omitted, but contends that it gives the real topic of the Gospel.
18. 2:10; 28:31; 9:12, 31; 10:33, 45; 14; 21, 41.
19. 8:38; 9:9; 13:26; 14:62.
20. Cf. Schweitzer, the Quest of the Historical Jesus, 1910, Wrede, ib. Patton, ib. Hoffmann, ib. Wendling, ib. Case, ib. et al. for the view that it is not used by Jesus but was invented by the evangelists.
21. 4:38. 22. 8:5. 23. 12:37.
24. 6:6. 25. 1:41. 26. 14:34. 27. 13:32.
28. So Paulus, Leben Jesu, 1828; Strauss, Leben Jesus, 1847; Lietzmann, Der Menschensohn, 1896; Schmiedel, ib.; Neumann, Jesus '06; Schmidt, The Prophet of Naz. 1905, and art. in En. Bib.; Bousset, Jesus, '06; Wellhausen, ib.; Wrede, ib.; Chas. van Norden, Jesus. An Unfin. Portrait. '06, and all extreme liberals.
29. As did Neander, Life of Christ, p. 99; Reuss, Hist. of Chr. Th. I., 199; Stanton, The Jewish and Chr. Messiah, p. 246; H. Turck, Hat Jesus gelebt u. lebt er noch heute? 1912.
30. Cf. Renan, Life of Jesus, p. 375.
31. Cf. 1:43, 3:10, 6:34, etc.
32. 9:35, 14:38, etc. 33. 10:21. 34. 10:45.
35. So most exegetes, Swete, com., 1898; Bruce, EGT; Gould, ICC; Robertson, Studies in Mark's Gospel, 1919; authors of introductions, Salmon, Weiss, Zahn, Feine, Peake, Moffatt, Belser, et al.; authors of N. T. Th., Holtzmann, Beyschlag, Weiss, Weinel, Bovon, Stevens, Sheldon, et al.; also E. A. Abbott, The Son of Man, 1910; Muirhead, The Eschatology of Jesus, p. 203; Salamond, art. Son of Man, HDB; Stalker, art. Son of Man, Int. St. Bib. Enc.; Wernle, Jesus, 1916; also Moffatt, The Theology of the Gospels, pp. 150ff.; also Tillmann, Der Menschensohn, '07, pp. 147-169. Cf. Patton, art. Son of Man, Journal of Religion, Sept. '22, for arguments vs. Jesus' use of the terms; cf. Allen, ICC, LXIIff. for its messianic significance in Enoch and 4 Es., and also in Q and Mk.
36. 2:10. 37. 8:31, 9:12, 31, 10:33, etc.
38. 10:45. 39. 9:9; 16:6.

40. 8:38, 13:26, 14:62. 41. Cf. 8:38, 13:32 with 13:26 and 14:62 with 14:61, where both terms are used of Jesus in the same context.
42. Lk. 3:38. 43. Rom. 8:14, Heb. 12:5ff, I Jn. 3:12.
44. Ps. 2:7. 45. Observe the title is seriously questioned in Mk. 1:1; cf. comms. by Swete; Bruce, EGT; Gould, ICC; Bacon; Robertson, et al.
46. 1:11.
47. Cf. Enoch 105; 2; 4 Es. 7:28, 29; 13:52; 14:9; Ps. Sol. 17:23, for the messianic significance of the term in contemporaneous Apocalyptic literature.
48. 9:7. 49. 8:29.
50. Cf. 1:24, 3:11 for the witness of the demonized and of the unclean spirits to His Sonship, or messiahship.
51. So emphatically urged by Jackson and Lake, Beginnings of Christianity, Pt. I. vol. I. p. 396 f, and yet does "not refer to O. T."
52. Cf. Thayer, Grk-Eng. Lex. of N. T., s. v., 1, 2, 3; Abbott-Smith, A Manual Grk. Lex. of N. T., s. v., 2(b) and (c); also art. Son of God, by Sanday, HBD; art. Son of God by Stalker, Int. St. Bib. Enc.
53. Cf. 13:32; cf. also the word from heaven, 1:11, "My Beloved Son," which emphasizes the moral tie between the Father and the Son. Cf. Moffatt, Theol. of the Gospels, p. 165, who claims "The Beloved" is "primarily messianic" in the Ascension of Isaiah.
54. The Christ of the Logia, chap. II. Cf. Studies in Mark's Gospel, chap. VI.
55. The Christ of the Logia, p. 49.
56. ib. p. 46; cf. R. W. Harding, The Authority of Jesus, '23, pp. 38, 203, who claims that "Jesus identified Himself with the Living Father," by "forgiving sins" and raising the dead.
57. Christian Origins, tr. '06, pp. 217, 219.
58. Beginnings of Gos. Story, p. XXVII.
59. ib. p. 222.
60. Rom. 9:5. 61. 1:8. 62. 1:1, 18.
63. 2 Cor. 4:4, Col. 1:15, 2:9. 64. 13:32.
65. Cf. titles in Chap. I. 66. Cf. his Chr. Origins, p. 222.
67. ib. 217, 219. 68. So Bacon, ib. p. XXVII.
69. Cf. Gould, Mk. in ICC; Whately, Christ as the Object of Faith in the Synoptic Gospels, Expos. Dec. '17, for mediating views of the Christ of Mark.
70. Cf. the author's The Function of Teaching in Christianity, 1913, chap. II.; see 4:38; 5:35; 9:17, 38; 10:17, 20, 35, etc.
71. Cf. 4:38; 5:35; 9:17.
72. Cf. Gould, ICC, on I:14, 15.
73. Chaps. IV and XIII. 74. 10:35-45. 75. 13: 26-32.
76. 1:40ff; 2: 1-12; 3: 1-5; Ch. 5; 6:34f. etc.
77. The Quest of the Historical Jesus, tr. 1910. 78. Das aelteste Ev.
79. Jesus, 1906. 80. Cf. Harnack, What is Christianity? 3d

ed. 1904, a one-sided over-emphasis on the ethical to the ignoring of the eschatological. 81. 2:20. 82. 8:3ff.; 9:9, etc.
83. 10:45; cf. Swete, Bruce, Gould, ad loc. 84. 14:24.
85. Beginnings of Gos. Story, ad loc. 86. Cf. Jesus and Paul, chap. VI, also Beginnings of Gos. Story (on 10:45). He follows Schweitzer in Das Abendmahl in Zusammenhang mit d. Leben Jesu u. Gesch d. Urc. '01, s. 42ff; J. Weiss, Das aelteste Ev. '03 . . . "ransom" idea in 10:45 is "the dogma of the early christology."
87. 10:45. 88. Jackson and Lake, ib. p. 57; for original sources cf. Pesikta, c. 174b, 185a, 191a, 191b. Cf. also Jno. 11:51f., for this view expressed by Caiaphas.
89. For evidence cf. Tischendorf, Nestle, Westcott and Hort; also Gregory, Einl.; Gould, ICC.
90. Cf. Ac. chs. 2-4; 1 Pet. 1:3; cf. 1 Cor. 15: 1-3, which implies that the early church (including Peter) emphasized the risen Christ.
91. Cf. Rom. 1:4.
92. Mt. 11:27=Lk. 10:22; observe Q merely records the historical fact of Jesus' expression of His filial consciousness. He does not argue, Mark does.
93. Cf. his introduction, 1:1-13; his climax, 14:61.

CHAPTER VI

THE PICTURE OF THE CHRIST IN MATTHEW'S GOSPEL

The next step in the evolution of the New Testament Christology is the picture of the Christ portrayed in Matthew's Gospel. The first step was the effort of Matthew the Apostle[1] to set down a simple memorandum of the chief sayings of Jesus, with a few out-standing events in His career. The second, some twenty, or more, years later, much more pretentious, was the effort of Mark to present Jesus as the wonder-working, redeeming Messiah, who is both Son of man and Son of God. Then follows in historical sequence the picture of the Christ in Matthew's Gospel.

1 *Not Concerned here about the Authorship.* The dramatic picture of Hamlet would be just as vivid and valuable if it could be demonstrated that Shakespeare did not write the play That masterpiece of art, The Last Supper, would be the same sublime picture of the Christ portrayed in His dignity and majesty and sadness just before the event of Black Friday, if it were positively certain that Leonardo da Vinci did not paint it. The popular picture which has been placed first among the portraits of Christ in the New Testament art gallery would be the same attractive portrait of Jesus the Messiah and the Master, if the claims of most modern critics against the Matthean authorship could be proved.[2] It is the picture we are studying now and not the painter of the picture.

2 *The Second Christian Apology.* Q is the oldest Christian document of which we have any certain knowledge. Mark's Gospel is the first Christian apology, Bruce to the contrary, who spoke of the Epistle to the Hebrews as "The First Apology for Christianity."[3] This is not to say that Mark was a "Paulinist"[4] who wrote his Gospel to prove the "essential deity" of Christ in harmony with Pauline Christology. It means to assert that it is an obvious fact that Mark had an "apologetic" pur-

pose, and that purpose was to prove the messiahship and Divine Sonship of Jesus in spite of His universally evident humanity.[5]

Now Matthew's Gospel is the second Christian apology of which we have any certain knowledge. It was written for the express purpose of proving that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah promised in the Old Testament Scriptures. It is useless to add here to our former discussion by denying that the author was a "Paulinist," or by seeking to prove the trustworthiness of Matthew's Gospel.[6]

3 *Its Early Date Fairly Certain.* It cannot be proved to be as early as is claimed by Zahn,[7] and yet it is most probable that Harnack's latest utterance on the subject[8] is close to the facts, namely, that Matthew was written "not later than 70." It is likely that this second apology to prove that Jesus is the Messiah followed closely upon the publication of Mark—within five or ten years at most.[9] If this dating of Matthew is correct, we see how early the apology arose among the Christians. This is natural, for the non-Christian Jews and most pagans within or without Palestine were ceaselessly denying the claims of the church that the Nazarene was the Messiah and the Founder of a new and better religion.

4 *A Composite Picture.* At least three, or possibly more, earlier pictures of Christ are incorporated, and fairly well blended, in the picture found in the Gospel of Matthew. The pictures of Q and Mark are incorporated, and so we find as prominent features in the Matthean[10] picture of Christ the teaching Messiah and the wonder-working Messiah. The two main pictures of Christ sometimes lie side by side without any effort to blend them into one harmonious picture. Example given: in Matthew 5-7, Jesus stands forth almost exclusively as the teaching Messiah (of Q) while in 8-9, He is almost as exclusively the wonder-working Messiah (of Mark). And yet in these last chapters the author has artfully combined a few features of the teaching Messiah.[11] This was easy for the author to do, for Mark before him had blended the features of the Petrine and the Logian Christ-pictures.

But the third prominent feature of the Christ incorporated into the Matthean picture is that of the virgin-born Christ portrayed in chapters I and II. Some scholars regard these chapters in toto as a later insertion, in the interest of

"dogma";[12] or that certain statements are interpolations in chapters I and II.[13] But most modern scholars seem inclined to include, not only the chapters in toto as a part of the Gospel but also as essentially in the form in which we find them in our best manuscripts and versions.[14] So, to present the entire Christ-picture of Matthew's Gospel, we must consider the bearing of chapters I and II upon the general picture portrayed in the remaining chapters.

Another significant element in the final picture of Matthew's Gospel is the author's own comments and connections, added here and there,[15] to make the life story logical (not chronological), and to preserve the unity of his literary production. The author's interpretation of Jesus' genuine sayings, as found in Q and Mark, and of events as recorded in Mark, helps to color the main features of the Christ-picture, borrowed from Q, Mark, and the infancy accounts, and to determine the general effect of the whole picture.

5 *The Son of Man.* The composite history of Jesus as the Son of man in Q and Mark is transferred from them almost in toto and incorporated into Mattew's Gospel.[16] We saw above that the term, as a messianic title, in Q emphasized especially the royal or eschatological phase of the Messiah's career; but in Mark accentuated the wonder-working and redemptive phases of the same.[17] Undoubtedly the author of Matthew's Gospel, with his fixed purpose to prove that Jesus is the Messiah, thinks the term is used in a messianic sense, and, of course, is himself using it as such, in all the 31 instances which he records. The Markan picture of Jesus as a real and ideal man is presupposed, and tacitly implied, by the writer of Matthew. He describes Him as teaching men to pray, "Forgive us our debts, etc.,"[18] but never intimates that Jesus Himself asked the Father to forgive His sins. He incorporated in his composite picture the Markan statement of His limitations in knowledge of the future.[19] But surely this title in the Gospel of Matthew emphasizes the messianic consciousness of Jesus.[20]

6 *The Son of God.* The three references to Jesus as the Son of God found in Q are brought over into his composite picture[21]; also the references in Mark.[22] In addition, we find the disciples, after the stilling of the storm on the sea of Galilee, calling Him "God's Son" and at Caesarea Phillippi when Jesus elicits from them a protestation of faith in His messiahship.[23]

Observe, in Q He is called God's Son only by the voice from heaven, by the devil, and by Jesus Himself. In Mark this title is referred to Jesus by the demons, or the demonized, by the voice from heaven, by the high priest (in the form "Son of the Blessed"),[24] and by the centurion. It is noticeable that it is not until we reach the Gospel of Matthew that we find the disciples ascribing to Jesus the title, "God's Son."[25] The new use of the title on the lips of the disciples will be discussed later on in this chapter under the caption, The Author's Added Touches.

7 *Jesus the Messiah.* The features of the Christ-pictures most prominent in Q and Mark are reproduced in Matthew's Gospel . . . the teaching Messiah of Q, the wonder-working Messiah of Mark. Also the royal or eschatological Messiah so prominent a feature in the Logian picture of the Christ, and drawn with lighter touches in Mark, although not to be understood as the centre of the picture, as held by Schweitzer and the Eschatological School,[26] occupies a rather conspicuous place in Matthew's Gospel. But in the emphasis upon, and the deeper coloring of, prominent features in the former pictures, conspicuous is the crimson line of redemption running through the Gospel of Matthew.[27] Although Q puts little emphasis upon the suffering Messiah, if indeed referring to His death at all;[28] and although Mark colors his picture of the Messiah with His sacrificial service in "giving His life a ransom for many"[29] and a sacrifice to ratify the covenant of forgiving grace.[30] Matthew represents the message of heaven, even before the birth of the virgin-born child, as demanding that His name should be called "Jesus," on the ground that "it is He that shall save His people from their sins."[31] The ancient Joshua could only deliver his people from heathen armies and human foes and physical ills, but this Messianic Joshua (or Jesus) shall be able to save them from the chains and ills of "sins." And Jesus Himself, as pictured by the author, thinks of His death as a "ransom" for the freeing of His people from the chains of "sins";[32] yea, as a sacrificial offering to ratify the covenant of reconciliation between God and men. Even Wernle admits[33] that Jesus "claims," in these sayings of Mark and Matthew, to be the "earthly Savior," because He is the "heavenly Messiah or Son of God."[34] Swete[35] calls the Jesus of Mark, 10:45 "the eternal Son of God" and "Redeemer."

Haussleiter[36] thinks Matthew's Gospel presents the "new operation of the Redeeming God." Moffatt[37] states that "the second part" (Mt. 20:28) "implies that the messianic vocation for Jesus involved not only a career of humble service but a service which culminated in death—and in death, not as a catastrophe but as a source of profit to many. . . . The term ransom (lutron) is never used elsewhere by Jesus. . . . The term is not Pauline, and the authenticity as well as the present position of the saying can be established if the context is broadly interpreted."[38] That is, the Matthean picture of Christ is preeminently a picture of the Redeemer-Messiah.

Of course, the author of Matthew's Gospel follows Mark in picturing the suffering Messiah as the Risen Christ. He not only alludes to the fact, as Mark does,[39] but also records the appearances of the Risen Jesus to the two Mary's and to the Eleven on the mountain in Galilee.[40] The Matthean picture receives its finishing touches as the author's pen describes the victorious, living Christ; the Messiah who has conquered, not only all human foes but even death and the grave, and now issues, with "all authority given unto Him in heaven and on earth," to His followers their marching orders to win "all the nations" and as "learners" to observe "all things whatsoever He commanded."[41]

8 *Jesus the Virgin-born Messiah.* Whatever else the author meant to say by introducing his Gospel with the birth and boyhood accounts, he surely intended to convey to the minds of his readers that this teaching, wonder-working, redeeming Messiah was a personality of no ordinary human but of an extraordinary Divine birth.

(1) *The Crux of the Account—The Fatherless Birth.* Matthew merely states, after giving the genealogy of Jesus, "Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When his mother Mary had been betrothed to Joseph, before they came together she was found with child of the Holy Spirit."[42] He emphasizes two points:— (a) Joseph was not the father of the child Jesus. "He knew her not till she had brought forth a son" (Jesus).[43] On the human side Jesus had no father. Mary was His mother, but no human father figures in her conception of the child Jesus. (b) The Holy Spirit is the Divine source of the conception. Mary was "found with child of the Holy Spirit." The preposition (ÈK) translated "of" denotes source.[44] The Holy

Spirit was the "source" . . . the Divine source—of the conception of Jesus; that is, by the power of the Holy Spirit, Mary was caused to conceive.[45] "The expression points at once to immediate divine causality, and to the holy character of the effect."[46]

These conclusions are based upon the manuscript evidence. Although one manuscript reads,[47] 1:16, "Joseph begat Jesus," and the Ferrar group of manuscripts (nos. 346, 556, 826, 828) insert a second "begat" between the names Joseph and Jesus,[48] the oldest and most reliable MSS.[49] read "Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ."[50] Allen[51] and Sweet[52] argue that even if the reading of S^1 and the Ferrar group of MSS. is accepted, the verb "begat" is used in the "legal" and not the biological sense. They argue thus because this statement occurs in the genealogy of Jesus, and because, according to Jewish custom, one's genealogy, to be legal, must trace the male line.[53] So we may rest assured that Matthew's Gospel never existed in any form which did not include the infancy accounts as we have them. "There never were forms of Matthew and Luke without the infancy narratives."[54] That is, the author of the First Gospel intended to say to his readers that Jesus the Messiah started His earthly life by a birth from a human mother but with no human father; that the Holy Spirit, in some mysterious way, was the source of the conception.

(2) *Historicity of this Account.* We may at once discard the theories of the extreme liberals who regard the virgin birth narratives as early Christian inventions based upon an Old Testament allusion to a virgin birth or the mythological birth stories of pagan religions.[55] For sane discussions of these destructive views see the monographs by Orr,[56] Box,[57] Vincent Taylor[58] and the articles by Professor Machen in Princeton Review, Jan., 1906 and Oct., 1927.[59] The author of the First Gospel is presuming to tell us historical facts. The birth of Jesus, he felt, occurred as he says it did. He discovered somewhere a document or continued to hear the tradition, (coming from Mary) that Jesus had an extraordinary birth which was not traceable to a human father but to the Holy Spirit. He was convinced that this account was as trustworthy as the accounts of His baptism, temptation, parable-speaking, transfiguration, etc., and so he included it in his Gospel. The naturalness of the story of

Jesus' conception, of Joseph's embarrassment until removed by assurance that the Divine Spirit was responsible for it, of the anxiety of Herod, the flight into Egypt, etc., and the main agreement of the account of Matthew with, but minor differences from, the infancy narrative of Luke, stamp it with the ear-marks of historicity.

(3) *Source of the Account.* It might have been preserved in a Jewish Christian document, or been handed down by tradition. The latter is more probably the source. Mary the mother of Jesus finally divulged to an inner circle of Christian women the secret of His marvelous birth. James and Jude, His half-brothers, would know it after awhile. It was likely not put in documentary form earlier than 50 or 60, or later, (but before the writing of the Gospel of Luke.) At any rate, the author of the Gospel, from 50 or 60 on, could easily have had access to reliable sources of the account of Jesus' wonderful birth.

(4) *Significance of the Account.* What did the author mean by introducing his Gospel with this thrilling story of Jesus' wonderful birth? It likely had already been accepted in the inner Christian circles as an evidence of the Divine personality of Jesus and as an explanation of His sinless character and splendid achievements. So it is placed at the head of Matthew's Gospel with the same apologetic purpose that prompted him to write the whole Gospel—to prove that Jesus of Nazareth is the Divine-human Messiah; that is, the Jewish Messiah promised in the Old Testament, who is at the same time both Divine and human. It helps to explain how He could be both Son of God and Son of man. It was not a scientific question with Matthew, and in this age of scientific achievement must not be made so. It was a religious question. It strengthened their faith in Jesus as the Son of God. They believed the account which came from Mary, because they believed in a personal God who could do the extraordinary through His Holy Spirit. As Dean Inge has recently expressed it,[60] religious men of the twentieth century have been forced to look upon the wondrous birth of Jesus "not as a religious question but a scientific one."[61] But Matthew does not undertake to explain how the Holy Spirit was able to cause conception in the womb of Mary, and how the spiritual and physical could blend in the production of Jesus' unique personality. He accepted it as a spiritual[62] fact without ques-

tioning the possibility of it. "What underlies the birth stories," writes Moffatt,[63] "is the conception that the messianic consciousness of sonship is based upon a special consciousness of sonship to the Father." "They" (the birth stories) are "naïve attempts to express the Christian sense of what was implied in the unique filial consciousness of Jesus, . . . and witness to the fact that His Sonship was more than messianic."

9 *The Added Touches by the Author.* We have seen how the author has blended into a composite picture the features of the Christ of Q and of Mark; that the picture of Mark's Christ was itself a blend of the Christ of Peter and of Q; and that he has introduced this composite picture by telling the naïve story of Jesus' birth without a human father. Furthermore, it was shown to be evident that the author introduced the thrilling messianic career of Jesus with a spiritual wonder-working birth, in order to heighten the Christian conception of the dignity and divinity of His person. Now we see the author put the finishing touches on his composite picture of the Christ by adding here and there personal comments and connecting phrases (either from some other trustworthy sources or his own spiritual interpretation[64] of the facts lying before him in his sources.)

(1) Observe the two additional testimonies to the Divine Sonship of Jesus, both expressing the conviction, apparently a growing conviction, on the part of the disciples, that Jesus is not only the Messiah but He is the Messiah who is the Son of God simultaneously with being a real man. Perhaps, they were beginning to reason in the inner circle of the apostles that He is the Messiah because He is the unique Son of God. His marvelous teachings and His wonder-works, as well as His strikingly sinless character, and especially His own abiding consciousness of Sonship to the Father,[65] have elicited from them a conviction that He is the Divine Messiah. So, after the stilling of the storm[66] on the sea of Galilee, "They that were with Him in the boat worshipped Him, saying, Of a truth Thou art the Son of God." Mark merely states,[67] "They were sore amazed" (at the stilling of the storm). Matthew either has another source, or interprets these words of Mark and (if Matthew the Apostle is the author), his own impression and that of the other disciples at the time. According to either account they are wondering about the greatness of His person; in Mat-

thew they "worship" Him. Certainly Matthew means to say, they are convinced, by this wonder-work, of His Divine personality. Bruce[68] aptly says: "The question it (potapos in 8:27 propounds) implies now is settled: Son of God." The disciples in 8:27 merely wonder at the greatness of His personality; in 14:33, under similar circumstances, they are convinced of His Divine Sonship and so "worship Him."[69] Considering Matthew's apologetic purpose and the natural meaning of the word "worship," it is evident that the author means to assert the disciples' belief in His superhuman character.

Especially is the above conclusion inevitable if the evidence of the protestation at Caesarea Philippi[70] and the unique filial consciousness of Jesus toward the Father as expressed in Mt. 11:27=Lk. 10:22 are taken into consideration. At Caesarea the disciples, through Peter as spokesman, firmly protested, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Observe in Mark it is expressed "Thou art the Christ,"[71] in Luke, "The Christ of God," but Matthew adds, "the Son of the living God." Coupling this addition with the statement on the sea of Galilee, "They worshipped Him, saying, Of a truth Thou art the Son of God,"[72] the conclusion is evident that Matthew, in his expanded statement of the Caesarean Christological confession, means to predicate the conviction of the disciples that Jesus is superhuman in character. Almost inevitable is this conclusion, if we link with these statements from the lips of the disciples the unique consciousness of Divine Sonship, expressed by Jesus Himself, and just woven into his Christ-picture by Matthew.[73] This Matthean statement of Jesus' filial consciousness toward the Father may well be regarded the historical basis of the Pauline Christology.[74] Weinel thinks, on the basis of Matthew 11:27, "Jesus claims to be the Son of God in a special sense."[75] So do H. Schumacher,[76] Haussleiter[77] Holdsworth,[78] Moffatt,[79] Jackson and Lake,[80] and others in recent monographs. But it must be borne in mind that not a hint has Matthew's Gospel given as to the pre-existence of Jesus, unless it be an implication of his account of the fatherless birth. At any rate, the eternal Sonship of Jesus is left to Paul, Hebrews, John, and the Apocalypse, for its enunciation and elaboration in the perfected Christology of the New Testament.

(2) Matthew's Gospel paints Jesus as the ecclesiastical Messiah. He is the Messiah who founds His church as the new

spiritual order, or as a definite organization for the solution of personal problems in the local assembly and for the propagation of the Kingdom.[81] If these statements be regarded as "interpolations" of the "editor,"[82] or as genuine words of Jesus,[83] in any event the Matthean picture presents Jesus as the ecclesiastical Messiah who sets up another spiritual order composed of those accepting Him.

(3) *Matthew adds the lines of the universal Messiah.* The conclusion reached by Wellhausen[84] that the message of Jesus, according to Matthew, is to be limited to "the house of Israel," is not founded on the facts. Moffat,[85] Allen,[86] and most modern scholars, think "the good news of the Kingdom is intended for the Gentiles." Allen[87] thinks the story of the Roman centurion's faith is inserted by Matthew to color the lines of universality in his Christ-picture, although he feels that the expression "Many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, etc., (vv. 11-12)" is incorporated from Q. The three late parables spoken in Jerusalem,[88] the scene of the last judgment,[89] and the final commission, depict the Matthean Christ as the universal Messiah; the Messiah whose Kingdom shall include "disciples of all the nations." Observe, we are trying to trace the features of the Matthean Christ, and so our effort does not depend upon an exact analysis of these sayings emphasizing the universal note as to how much of them Jesus actually uttered and how much the author added.[90]

10 *The Pictures in Q, Mark, and Matthew Compared.*

(1) The Picture in Matthew's Gospel reproduces the striking features in the Christ-pictures of Q and Mark; the teaching and royal Messiah; the wonder-working and redeeming Messiah, but deeply coloring the teaching and redeeming features.

(2) While Q puts most stress upon the *offices,* Mark most upon the *career,* Matthew puts most upon the *person* of the Messiah. He is the Son of man and the Son of God; even in His birth the Divine Spirit and a human mother co-operate, and the disciples later worship Him as the Son of God.

(3) Although the author of the Matthean picture does not directly and consciously include the eternal relationship of the Father and the Son, yet by the account of Jesus' fatherless birth and by the emphasis on His special filial consciousness,

coupled with the disciples' worshipping Him as God's Son, he paves the way for the Pauline doctrine of the heavenly, eternal Christ.

(4) In its added features of the authoritative, ecclesiastical, and cosmopolitan Christ, the Matthean picture of Jesus is a distinct step forward (as compared with Q and Mark) in the development of New Testament Christology.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VI

1. Cf. chap IV., for the authorship of Q.
2. Cf. Moffat, ib. pp. 243 ff; Peake, ib. pp. 122 ff.; Allen, ICC—all vs. the apostolic authorship. Cf. Zahn, Einl., Robertson, Mt. in BHS and The Christ of the Logia, Ch. I. for it.
3. See his The Epis. to the Hebrews: The First Apology for Christianity, 1899.
4. Cf. Pfleiderer, ib. Wendling, ib., Wrede, ib., Weiss, (esp. his Christus, '09, early chaps.) and Bacon, ib., for the extreme liberal view that Mark is a "Paulinist" apologist.
5. Cf. chaps. I and V for the historicity of Mark.
6. Cf. our chap. I. Cf. also Allen, ICC, for the ascription of much Matthean material to a late "Redactor"; Peake, ib. p., 123, who calls it a "Catholicised Gospel."
7. Einl. tr. 1917, II. 506 ff.
8. Date of Acts and Syn. Gospels, '11.
9. Cf., however, for a late date, Peake, ib. p. 123; Moffatt, ib. pp. 246 ff.
10. This term used to denote the picture of Christ in the Gospel of Mt., while Logian will be used to denote the Christ picture of Q.
11. Cf. esp. 8:11, 9: 6, 14 f.
12. Cf. Moffatt, p. 250 f, for authors taking this position.
13. Cf. Moffatt, ib. for critics holding this view, and his reply; Wellhausen, Ev. Mt., who ignores these chaps. altogether.
14. So Box, The Virgin Birth; Orr, the Virgin Birth, Moffatt, ib. Allen, ICC, et al.
15. Cf. 3:3, 13, 14; 4: 12 f. 23; 5:1, 2; 7:28 f.; 16:16 f. (possibly), etc.
16. Term occurs in Mt. 31 times, 17 referring to His state of service and suffering; 14 to His state of exaltation. Cf. Moulton and Geden, Concordance to Grk. Text., 1900.
17. See chaps. IV and V. 18. 6:12.
19. 24:36. 20. Cf. Allen, ICC, pp. LXVI, LXXI ff.
21. 3:17; 4: 1-11; 11: 27. 22. 8:29; 26: 63; 27: 40, 43, 54.
23. 14:33; 16:16.
24. 14:61. 25. For the meaning of the term in Q cf. chap. IV; in Mark, chap. V; observe that the title is not in the best

13030

MSS. in Mk. 1:1 (cf. Gould, ICC); cf. 1:23, where the author applies to Jesus the term Immanuel (God with us), though it is not to be pressed literally. cf. Allen, ad locum; Moffatt, Theol. of the Gospels, p. 172.

26. Bousset, Jesus, pp. 74ff; J. Weiss, Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes, s. 238 f., et al. Cf. footnote in chap. IV.

27. 1:21; 9:6; 16:21 ff.; 17:22 f.; 20:28; 26:28.

28. Cf. chap. IV.

29. 10:45. 30. Cf. Bacon, Jesus and Paul, chap. VI; Bruce, in EGT, Gould in ICC, and Swete, Com., ad loc.

31. 1:21. 32. Cf. Allen, ICC, on 20:28, who thinks that Jesus saves by dying "as a martyr"; cf. Bacon, Mk. 10:45, parallel, who denies to Jesus the saying, but thinks the "Paulinist Redactor" means "substitution" by use of the preposition ἀντί, for.

33. Jesus, 1916; so Weinel, Bib. Th. d. N. T. '11, Abs. I.

34. Cf. Th. Lit. Zeit. '16. 3. 55 f. for Troeltzsch's denial that this is the view of "Jesus," claiming Wernle mistakes the "early church" view for that of Jesus.

35. Com. on Mk. 1898.

36. Problem des Matthaus-Evangelium, 1901, s. 8ff.

37. The Theology of the Gospels, 1913, p. 145.

38. Cf. the view of E. A. Abbott, Paradosis, 1904, p. 3 f., The Son of Man, 1910, p. 3254 f. 3271, that "ransom" means "an expenditure, drop by drop, of His life-blood, to be summed up in the pouring forth of His soul on the cross," of O. Holtzmann, Life of Jesus, p. 167 f. that Jesus sacrifices Himself as any other man would for his fellows. For the view of His death as a "substitutionary" sacrifice for the salvation of men cf. Robertson, Studies in Mark's Gospel, p. 74 f.; Farmer, Mark, Gos. of, Int. Stan. Bib. Enc. (on 10:45=Mt. 20; 28).

39. Letting Mk. close at 16:8. 40. 28: 9f., 16 f.

41. 28:18-20.

42. 1:18. 43. 1:25.

44. Cf. Robertson, Gram. p. 598 f. 45. 1:20, "That which is conceived in her is of the Holy Spirit."

46. Bruce, EGT, I. 66. 47. 51; cf. Burkitt, Evangelion da Mepharesha, II. 258 ff. Cf. Lobstein, The Virgin Birth of Christ, p. 121, who does not use this MS. evidence as proof against the virgin birth.

48. Cf. Sweet, art. Virgin Birth, Int. St. Bib. Enc.

49. Sinaitic and Vatican. -50. 1:16. 51. ICC, p. 8.

52. ib. 53. Art. Genealogy of Jesus Christ, by Sweet, in Int. St. Bib. Enc.; by Bacon, in HDB.

54. J. Weiss, Theologische Rundschau.

55. So Schmiedel, ib.; Neumann, ib.; Wellhausen, Ev. Mt. '04; Wrede, ib. Edmunds, ib. Gilbert, Jesus, 1912, (calls them "legends"); Soltau, The Birth of Jesus Christ, p. 65, et. al., not to mention the radicals, Jensen, Drews, J. M. Robertson, W. B. Smith, Steudel, Kalthoff, et al., who deny the historicity of Jesus. Cf. Fred Palmer, The Virgin Birth, 1924, who distinguishes between the possibility and the historicity of the vir-

gin birth, the latter being a "detail of Christian tradition of no importance whatever," and holds that "opinion either way should not affect any man's religious or ecclesiastical standing."

56. ib. 57. ib. 58. ib.; cf. ch. I for titles.

59. Cf. also Thorburn, the Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels, 1916; other monographs listed in next chapter on the virgin birth in Lk. I.

60. Outspoken Essays, 1922.

61. Cf. chap. I on the Trustworthiness of Matthew and Luke, for the scientific demonstration claimed for parthenogenesis in the lower forms of life; cf. Orr, ib. p. 221f.

62. "With child of the Holy Spirit," 1:18; cf 1:20.

63. Theol. of the Gospels, p. 136.

64. Cf. Allen, ICC, esp. pp. XV, LII-LVIX, for a careful analysis of sources, showing the "additions" by the "editor." We prefer to say the author's additions, as above, so do not endorse in toto Allen's analysis of the strata in Mt.

65. As expressed in Mt. 11:27=Lk. 10:22.

66. 14:33. 67. 6:51.

68. EGT, I. 211. 69. Observe, neither Bruce, ib., nor Allen, ib., explains in what sense the disciples recognized Jesus as the Son of God.

70. 16:16. 71. 8:29. 72. 9:20.

73. 11:27. 74. Feine, Theol. d. N. T., '10, s. 48 ff. says, "Paul's doctrine of Christ rests on the words of Jesus in Mt.11:27=Lk. 10:22."

75. Bib. Theol. d. N. T. '11, Abschnitt I. 76. Die Selbstoffenbarung Jesus bei Mt. 11:27 (=Lk. 10:22).

77. Jesus, 1911, Sec. I, who overstates it by asserting Jesus' consciousness of "eternal Godhead."

78. The Christ of the Gospels, 1911. 79. The Theol. of the Gospels, 1913, pp. 134 ff. "He claims for Himself the supreme authority in the divine revelation."

80. Beginnings of Christianity, Pt. I. vol. I. 400, but they are doubtful as to the exact meaning of the term.

81. 16:18, 18:17 f., 28:18-20.

82. So Allen, ICC.

83. So by all conservative exegetes and by many moderate liberals, Meyer, Com.; Bruce, EGT; Plummer, McNeile, Robertson, Comms.; Weiss, Stevens, Sheldon, et al.

84. Ev.—Mt. 1904; also Einl., 62 85. Intro. 256 ff.

86. ICC, LXXVI ff. 87. ib. 88. 21:28-22:14.

89. 25:31-46. 90. Cf. Allen, ICC, pp. XV-LXXVI; Moffatt, Intro. pp. 256 ff.

CHAPTER VII

AN ARTIST'S PORTRAIT OF THE HISTORICAL JESUS

While hitherto we have had to study mere sketches of the Christ, it is now our pleasure to study a real portrait by a literary artist. The author of Q sketched only the teaching and eschatological Messiah with a few pen strokes suggesting the career of the Wonder-worker and the Redeemer. Mark's sketch showed the heavy coloring on the wonder-working career of the Messiah but inserted a few pen strokes to suggest His teaching, redeeming, and royal functions as the Son of man and Son of God. The Matthean picture included all these features but they were not perfectly blended with the master hand of an artist. Before reaching Luke's Gospel we have only fragmentary sketches of the Christ; in it we face the first portrait of Him by a literary artist.

1 *The Most Beautiful Book in the World.* This is the estimate of Luke's Gospel by Renan.[1] Ian Maclaren also writes: "There are times when one wishes that he had never read the New Testament Scriptures—that he might some day open the Gospel according to Luke, and the most beautiful book in the world might come upon his soul like sunrise."[2] It is the most beautiful book in the world for many reasons, but primarily because it paints the most beautiful portrait of the historical Jesus, the most beautiful character of the ages.

2 *Its Author.* Extreme liberals deny that Luke wrote this beautiful book; not because the external or internal evidence demands it, but because of their conclusion against the Lukan authorship of the Book of Acts. But Harnack,[3] Ramsay,[4] and Robertson[5] have recently put forth well nigh unanswerable arguments in favor of the Lukan authorship. However, while our discussion of the portrait of Jesus in the Third Gospel presupposes the Lukan authorship, it would be just as apposite if some other historian-artist wrote it.[6]

3 *A Composite Portrait.* Literary experts[7] by careful study have been able to detect the almost invisible seams which mark

the sources of Luke's Gospel. He has incorporated into his portrait of Jesus the original sketch of the teaching, royal Messiah drawn by Q; the wonder-working, redeeming Messiah rudely but vividly drawn by Mark; the composite picture of Matthew (including Q and Mark's sketches) but emphasizing anew the Divine personality of the teaching, wonder-working, redeeming, royal Messiah. In addition to these sketches of the Christ which Luke has artfully blended into his composite portrait, we find him drawing on another picture, the Perean picture (called P or L by different scholars)[8] of Christ. Still another picture of the birth and boyhood of Jesus appears in Luke I and II.[9] According to his own introductory statement,[10] "many" other sources lay before the literary artist who painted the first real portrait of Jesus. In addition to these sketched features, Luke's psychology and personality put the finishing touches on a portrait which is a blending of all the Christ sketches which he had before him in his studio. Luke was a "psychologist," as is claimed by Loisy,[11] Robertson,[12] and Carpenter,[13] the last named devoting a whole chapter to "St. Luke the Psychologist." He could read, like a book, personalities and character sketches. He could appreciate the character sketches of Jesus lying before him and, much more, being an artist, he could paint the leading features of those sketches into his composite portrait, so as not to destroy the reality of the original features but so as to give an artistic effect to the composite portrait.

4 *The Portrait of an Artist.* Plummer,[14] in his introduction to Luke's Gospel, refers to the "legend that Luke was a painter." If not with the brush, certainly with the pen, he was a painter. Maurice Jones has done Luke a great injustice in placing him and Matthew in the same category as painters of the Christ. "The superiority of St. Matthew and St. Luke is that of a portrait by Rembrandt to a mechanical snap-shot."[15] Luke, but not Matthew, is a Rembrandt who has painted a historical and a classical portrait of the historical and cosmopolitan Christ. Carpenter devotes a whole chapter to "S. Luke the Artist."[16] Robertson describes it thus,[17] "One would not expect in such a writer a slavish copying, but intelligent blending of the material into an artistic whole." This is exactly what takes place, and so the product is the "superior" portrait of the "historical Jesus."

(1) *Not a one-sided picture.* The painting of the Christ in Luke's Gospel is not an amateur's sketch. It is not a picture that is over-colored in spots. The shading and the coloring and the blending of the diverse features of the Christ are the work of a master pen-painter. The painters of the Christ in Q and Mark and Matthew are amateurs at pen-painting. The writer of Q has highly colored the didactic and the eschatological Christ and the blending is done with a hand so bunglesome that modern scholars are divided into two camps as to the real character of the Christ and His Kingdom.[18] The writer of Mark's Gospel has over-colored the wonder-working career of the Messiah; has heavily shaded the unique filial consciousness of Jesus; has only slightly colored His didactic and redemptive missions. The author of Matthew's Gospel, by unloading the material of Q almost bodily, and by weaving into his outline, rather rudely, the Gospel of Mark, has really hung upon his Gospel walls a number of differing pictures of the Christ, rather than "a harmonious" portrait.

(2) *The Christ of Luke a Symmetrical Figure.* He has drawn from the same sources as Matthew, but with his keen psychological analysis of the various Christ-pictures before him and with his consummate skill as a pen-painter, he has artistically blended divergent lines and opposite features into "an harmonious picture."[19] The "recent discovery" (?) of Lt. Col. G. Mackinlay,[20] that there is a lack of unity in Luke's Gospel until you reach 19:29, may be regarded as an evidence of failure to appreciate Luke's artistic literary skill. With artistic deftness Luke has blended the Divine and the human in his birth-story of Jesus. "And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee; wherefore also the holy thing which is begotten shall be called the Son of God."[21] And yet this holy Son of God is born of a human mother and "advanced in wisdom and stature and in favor with God and men."[22] From the beginning he blends the features of the Son of God and the child of Mary into the harmonious lines of a single portrait. With the same artful skill he combines the divergent lines of Jesus' messianic mission—the Teacher and the King, the Wonder-worker and the Redeemer.[23] So from either point of view—that of Jesus' personality or that of His

messianic offices—the Christ of Luke is a symmetrical figure, a harmonious picture, a superior portrait.

5 *The Artist's Sources Sifted.*

(1) *Luke a Literary Artist but a Historian, too.* He tells us of his literary and historical habits in his confidential confession at the opening of his Gospel.[24] Blass[25] correctly estimates Luke's attitude toward his sources: "Since many writers have undertaken to restore from memory a narrative of the things which have come to pass among us," etc. He is not a novelist. Like all true artists, Luke is a man of imagination. But he is not an H. G. Wells in creative literature who before he reaches the field of recognized historical sources, by giving his imagination free play with the hypotheses of modern biologists and palaeontologists, writes twelve chapters to his An Outline of History.[26] Luke begins immediately after his introduction to tell a straightforward story based upon an Aramaic document,[27] or upon personal interviews with Mary and others.[28] Harnack,[29] though inclined to regard 1:35 as an "interpolation," concedes that the simplicity and naturalness of Luke's birth-story of Jesus preclude its classification with the mythological birth-stories of pagan gods and goddesses.[30] Robertson expresses himself[31] in stronger terms: "The delicate tact and restraint with which Luke gives the story add to the impression of genuineness and remove the narrative entirely from the mythological stories of the gods and goddesses of Babylon and Greece."[32] So Luke handled all his sources. He was a historian. He would not reproduce a story or a saying found in his sources until he thoroughly sifted the evidence for the historicity of the event and the trustworthiness of the saying. Harnack concedes this:[33] "He certainly believes himself to be a historian (see the prologue) and so he is, but his powers are limited." That is, when Luke admits the "miraculous" virgin birth and the physical resurrection of Jesus, Harnack hesitates to class him as a trustworthy historian.[34] Everywhere else he may be depended upon for telling us the facts and the truth. Ramsay, however, does not hesitate to estimate Luke as a "historian of the first rank,"[35] and so places him "along with the very greatest historians." As Moffat concludes, "Luke did not rest his narrative on unsifted traditions."[36]

(2) *Pauline Influence.* But did not the great Apostle with whom Luke the physician associated for twenty, or more, years

exert considerable influence upon the admiring friend? Plummer[37] concedes that, with justice, the Gospel of Luke has been called the "Gospel of Paul"; that "the tone of the Gospel is Pauline"; but this means, "It exhibits the liberal and spiritual nature of Christianity. It advocates faith and repentance apart from the works of the law and tells abundantly of God's grace and mercy." Both Feine[38] and J. Weiss[39] are disposed to minimize the "editorial" coloring of historical facts and teachings by Luke. They suppose that he had a "pre-canonical Luke" before him, in which occurred the didactic adaptations of Gospel facts and truth to the early church conditions. This, and not direct Pauline influence, helps to explain the later coloring in the Lukan portrait.[40] Bruce, although admitting the motive of "edification" in Luke's writing the Gospel, yet stoutly denies there is any "trace of a dominant theological or controversial aim. The writer is not a Paulinist in the controversial sense of the word." Though in "sympathy with Christian universalism," "the author is not a Paulinist in a theological sense."[41] He is "eclectic" but desires, above all things else, to "inculcate on his readers the graciousness of Christ."[42] But as Sheldon well says,[43] "When Luke wrote, Christian universalism was no party shibboleth," and so we may safely deny that "Paulinism" is a perverting force in Luke's Gospel.[44]

To sum up as to the Pauline influence on Luke: (a) The admiring, attending physician was irresistibly attracted and charmed by the personality and teachings of Paul. Through years of personal contact the Apostle's universal Gospel of grace was not only heartily accepted by Luke, but had become a shaping force in his religious thinking and living. So we may assert, without fear of successful contradiction, the personal and theological influence of Paul on Luke was considerable. (b) But Luke was a historian as well as a psychologist and an artist. Hence he was true to the facts of his sources (documents and information secured by personal interviews). He could not have accepted Paul's Christology had he not found in his historical sources facts confirming it. So we conclude: Since the Pauline Gospel of the "heavenly" Christ and universal "grace," had been woven into the warp and woof of Luke's personality by his religious experience and thinking, he selected from his vast mass of sources[45] only those events and teachings which contributed to the portrait of the gracious, universal

Christ. He did not pervert the facts to prove his point. He simply "omitted"[46] those touches of Q and Mark (and possibly of his other sources) which did not easily blend into the portrait of the gracious, universal Christ.

(3) *The Personal Touch of Luke the Artist.* As Carlyle in writing the biography of Frederick the Great also wrote his autobiography between the lines, so did Luke in writing the life-career of Jesus. As Leonardo da Vinci could not paint the Last Supper without putting into the face of his Christ the personal touches of his own interpretation of the Jesus of the Gospels and the Christ of Roman history; so Luke, the Leonardo da Vinci of the Synoptic trio of Christ-painters, could not pen-paint the Jesus of the Gospels without coloring his portrait with the personal touches of his interpretation of the Christ of Paul and of the Christ of his own experience. Luke, while painting Jesus as the Christ of "grace," the Christ of "Christian universalism," the Seeker and Savior of the Lost,[47] was also painting the personality of a sinner saved by the "grace" of the universal Christ of Greeks and Romans. The author, finding proofs in his sources for the universal Christ of "grace," shows a personal interest in this feature of the Christ not found in Q or Mark or Matthew. These flashes, in Luke's Gospel, from the face of the saving Christ, are not so much the personal touches of the literary artist, as of the Christian soul responsive to the Christ who "seeks and saves the lost."[48]

(4) *Then is the Christ of Luke "the historical Jesus?"* The extreme liberals[49] would answer with an emphatic, No. The ultra-conservatives[50] would answer with a still more positive, Yes. But the great majority of New Testament scholars,[51] whose conclusions are safe for modern Christians to follow, do not champion, or accept, either extreme. We would reply (a) that the Christ of Luke is the historical Jesus of Galilee as interpreted by honest eye-and-ear witnesses. In the significant features of His person and His mission Luke has painted the Christ as He was and lived and taught among men. But this portrait of the Christ by Luke rests ultimately on the impressions and interpretations of others (Matthew, Peter, Mark, et al.) which fact ought to restrain us from over-statements; (b) On the other hand, Luke has likely colored the historical Jesus with realistic touches from the Christ of the early church, the Christ of Paul, and the Christ of his own experience. It is the

Lukan Christ who greets us in the Third Gospel; none the less is it the historical Jesus who claimed to be the Christ and as such was accepted by His first disciples and the early church. It is the historical Jesus as experienced and painted by Luke the historian and the artist.[52]

6 *The Christ-Features of Q, Mark, and Matthew Reproduced.* Luke was not a copyist. The literary, cultural, and religious stamp of his personality shines forth from every page.[53] And yet he was so faithful to his sources that much of the historical and didactic material contained in them found its way into his composite portrait; but not until it had received the Lukan stamp and had proved its fitness for a place in his "harmonious picture."

(1) *The teaching and royal Messiah of Q.* While Luke does not reproduce Q in toto, he is faithful to his teaching source in painting Jesus as the Teacher. Whereas Matthew and Mark each refers to Jesus twelve times as Teacher, Luke calls Him Teacher[54] fifteen times. He records the Sermon in the Plain[55] and distributes in various sections teachings which Matthew collects in addresses.[56] He records most of the Matthean parables, and eighteen are peculiar to the Third Gospel.[57] In Luke Jesus is the Great Teacher. At the same time he brings over the eschatological message and paints the Christ as the King riding into Jerusalem on the animal of royalty,[58] and later as "the Son of man coming in a cloud and with power and great glory."[59] In Luke Jesus is primarily the ethico-religious Teacher but at the same time the coming King.

(2) *The wonder-working, redeeming Messiah of Mark.* Especially does Luke magnify Jesus as the Healer. Of twenty-six miracles of healing Luke gives sixteen and five are peculiar to him.[60] Of the three cases of raising the dead he gives two and one is peculiar to him.[61] Luke gives thirteen of the eighteen miracles in Mark. Some think it strange that "a man of science"[62] should weave into his history of Jesus so many wonder-works. So Harnack,[63] Percy Gardner,[64] Carpenter,[65] accuse Luke of "making it happen" because he "loves a good miracle," or of being "uncritical" in his handling of "miracles." But many think his "scientific" ability, as well as his historical insight, should increase our faith in the wonder-stories of his Gospel. So especially may be cited Homan,[66] Wace,[67] Ramsay,[68] Robertson,[69] who speak of him as "a man of science,"

of his "ability to judge rightly in questions involving both science and faith," as "having a passion for the truth, for the facts of nature and of grace." At any rate, this "man of science," this "historian of the first rank," himself an eye-witness of some of Paul's wonder-works,[70] paints his Christ as a Wonder-worker, not only by reproducing the Markan sketch of the wonder-working Messiah, but by adding from Q and other sources new touches of the Wonder-worker. No evidence is forth-coming that Luke invented stories of wonder-working or "made it happen," because "he thought it ought to happen"; or was "allegorizing"[71] with stories from nature. As a scientist he was deeply interested in the wonders of Nature; as a Christian he was profoundly interested in the wonders of "grace"; as a faithful historian he recorded both; as an artist he blended the pictures of Jesus the Wonder-worker and the Redeemer. Jesus is the Healer of the body and soul; the Great Physician. This is the Markan sketch of Christ with the added historical, literary, and artistic touches of Luke.

(3) *The Divine-human child of Matthew, the Divine-human Messiah of Q and Mark.* It is not clear that Luke included Matthew's Gospel in his "many"[72] sources, although he depicts the Divine-human child much as Matthew does. It is evident, from a careful study of chapters I and II in Matthew and Luke, that Luke is using an independent source (or sources). But the fact to be reckoned with is, Luke paints the picture of the Divine-human babe of Bethlehem's manger.[73] Moreover, the essential features of the Jesus-babe and His "Spirit" birth are the same in the Matthean and the Lukan pictures.[74]

(4) *The Cosmopolitan Christ of Matthew.* But Luke has other incidents and sayings in his sources on the universal Christ, and so he has outdone Matthew in painting the cosmopolitan character of the Christ.[75]

7 *The Added Touches in the Portrait.* In the discussion which follows we include all the added features of the "many" sources, not found in Q or Mark or Matthew; also those features presented in Luke from a new angle or with a new emphasis.

(1) *A new emphasis upon the human Jesus.* We have seen that Q, Mark, and Matthew sketch Jesus as a real but ideal man. Luke adds a new emphasis to the reality of the human Jesus. There is only one other writer in the New Testament,

the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews,[76] who puts a greater emphasis upon the humanity of Jesus.[77] Q and Mark and Matthew call Him the Son of man, and Mark in particular, depicts His real humanity. But Luke, not only calls Him Son of man twenty-six times, sixteen of which refer to His life of service and suffering, but he traces back to Adam His pedigree. Jesus is a member of the human race in regular descent. He is the human as well as the humanitarian Christ. He began His career by being "born." He was a real human babe, although blessed by shepherds, by Simeon and Anna the prophetess.[78] More than that, He was a normal growing child and boy.[79] Hess[80] has given a rather graphic delineation of Jesus' human development: "Jesus was a model normal man, with normal growing piety, free from one-sidedness and extravagance, following the ethical vs. the ritual law of God." While this is a "one-sided" description of the Christ of Luke, it is an exact picture of the normal growing human Jesus of Luke 2: 40-52. At the close of the infancy incidents, Luke expressly says, "And the child grew and waxed strong,[81] filled with wisdom; and the grace of God was upon him."[82] His body continued to grow in a normal way and His mind to expand so as to receive "wisdom." More, the "favor" of God was upon Him from childhood, and from the earliest moments of consciousness He began to grow spiritually and religiously.

Luke alone lifts the curtain[83] and shows us the growing religious boy Jesus. While in Jerusalem with His parents He naturally gravitated to the temple, His "Father's house"; naturally, considering His expanding mind and religious soul, to the spot where the great religious teachers "asked and answered questions." He joins the teaching circle, because He loves the truth. He is so deeply interested and "preoccupied"[84] with the things of His "Father" that He forgets the time the caravan is to leave for Nazareth. Yea, even next day when the fond parents returned to find the lost Jesus, they "found him in the temple, sitting in the midst of the teachers, both hearing them, and asking them questions." He was "growing," not only physically and intellectually but religiously and spiritually.

Especially does Luke emphasize the human Jesus in his portrayal of Him as a man of prayer. Jesus was dependent upon His Father for spiritual strength and wisdom and guidance. He is represented as "filled with the Holy Spirit," as are Elizabeth

and Zacharias.[85] At the crises of His career He prays—at His baptism[86]; at His rising popularity in Galilee[87]; when the opposition of the Scribes and Pharisees threatened[88]; just before the Great Confession of the disciples at Caesarea Philippi[89]; at the beginning of the transfiguration[90]; on the giving of the Model Prayer[91]; in the agony of Gethsemane.[92] In Luke's portrait of Jesus He is the normal man of physical health, of mental expansion, and of spiritual fellowship with the Father which is nurtured by perpetual prayer and which culminates in a perfect submission to the Father's will to drink the cup of Calvary.[93]

(2) *The Divinity of Christ re-interpreted.* Luke, faithful to his sources, reproduces all the references in Q, Mark and Matthew, in which Jesus is called "God's Son," "the Son," "My Beloved Son," "Son of God."[94] In addition, he represents an angel, even before the birth of the Divine-human babe, as re-assuring the virgin with the promise that "the holy thing which is begotten (or born) shall be called the Son of God." There can be little doubt that Luke, a cultured man of science and thoroughly acquainted with the mythological birth-stories of gods and goddesses, and with the contemporary disgusting emperor-worship, was convinced, by a careful study of his sources, that Jesus was more than a man; that in a unique sense He was "God's Son," and so worthy of being trusted and worshipped. Also at the transfiguration Luke adds, as spoken by the voice from heaven, the titles, "My Chosen," "My Elect."

In what sense did Luke understand the expression "Son of God," or "My Chosen Son"? Certainly not as a Divine man, as Adam was called "the Son of God."[95] Adam was created "God's Son," Jesus was "begotten of the Holy Spirit"[96] as "God's Son." Luke evidently thought of Gabriel's promise to Mary as assuring her that the promised child should be "God's Son" in an extraordinary sense. But did he think of the term as expressing the incarnation of the "eternal" Son of God? There is not a verbal hint in a single use of the term in Luke that he was thinking of the "essential Deity" of Jesus as the Son of God.[97] To reach this conclusion either the language of Luke must be interpreted in the Pauline sense,[98] or the term Deity must be deleted of its accepted significance.[99] Moreover, the expressions used by the Father (voice from heaven) at His baptism and the transfiguration, "My Beloved Son," "My

Son," "My Chosen," forcefully suggest the official messianic sense of the term.[100] But this cannot be all Luke understands Jesus to mean when, at twelve in the midst of the teachers, He spoke of "being about His Father's business."[101] Nor is it all he means in recording Jesus as saying: "And no one knoweth who the Son is, save the Father; and who the Father is, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him."[102] To Luke Jesus is more than man but not spoken of as "God,"[103] or as "Deity," but as Son of God, the Chosen Son of God, in the sense that He sustains to the Father a superhuman relation and experiences an intimate knowledge of the Father which gives Him authority to "reveal" Him to men. Plummer[104] has over-stated the Lukan interpretation of this "aerolite from the Johannean heaven."[105] "And it contains the whole of the Christology of the Fourth Gospel." Hase is not justified in thus characterizing this saying. Most modern critics think of it as belonging to Q,[106] so it might be more fittingly called "an aerolite from the Logian heaven." Indeed John himself may be indebted to Q, rather than Q to John. Hase did not mean it to be taken literally. Again, Plummer surely cannot mean in a literal sense to assert, "It contains the whole of the Christology of the Fourth Gospel." How can any legitimate exegesis get out of Luke 10:22 the pre-existence of an eternal Logos?[107] Or, the creative activity of the pre-existent Son?[108] Or, essential Deity or equality with God?[109]

(3) *The redemptive mission of Jesus re-emphasized.* The word ransom[110] does not occur in Luke, but the idea of Saviour or Redeemer runs, like a crimson cord, from the opening to the closing chapter. Jesus is the Healer of human diseases, even the most loathsome. He heals five chronic cases peculiar to Luke: the old woman with a curved spine,[111] the man with dropsy,[112] the ten lepers,[113] the case of surgery,[114] and restores to life the son of the widow of Nain.[115] It took a sympathizing physician like Luke to see in Jesus the Great Physician who came not only to heal the bodies of men and women, but also the social body[116] and the souls of sinners.[117] Luke paints Jesus in the process of saving even the greatest sinners, the scarlet woman of the street whose presence in Simon's home shocked his moral dignity;[118] He ate and drank with "tax-collectors and sinners" until He must vindicate His conduct, which He did by uttering the three parables of "grace," the lost sheep,

the lost coin, the lost boy[119]; He sought and saved Zaccheus the "sinner"[120]; even on the cross He promised the penitent thief "Today shalt thou be with Me in paradise."[121]

Nor does Luke omit the sufferings and death of Christ. His death is a part of the program of redemption. It is argued by J. Weiss[122] that, because the "ransom" passage, Mk. 10:45 (=Mt. 20: 28) is not reproduced by Luke in 22:24 ff., the idea of ransom was foreign to Jesus' teaching but was a "dogma of the early church." But on the other hand, Luke records the heart of the supper passage in which the death of Christ is a sacrifice to ratify the covenant.[123] That he sees the death of Christ as a part of His redemptive program is proved by his record of Jesus' announcements of His death,[124] and His pungent pronouncements on the "necessity" (Greek deî) of His death.[125] Carpenter[126] aptly describes "S. Luke's Gospel as a Gospel of sacrifice and a Gospel for sinners. It contains the word 'sinners' more often than all the other three put together."[127] So agree Plummer[128] and Robertson.[129] It is to be observed that in the parable of the Pharisee and Publican, the latter is approvingly reported as praying, "God, be merciful (hìleōs)[130] to me the sinner," which literally means, "God, be placated, or reconciled, to me, etc."[131] Feine[132] thinks that not only in Mark 10:45, but in the supper passage "Jesus ascribes to His death expiatory significance," but Carl Clemen[133] is sure that He does not. Dean Farmer[134] asserts, "The Gospels (Synoptics) are in perfect harmony with the Epistles in their stress upon the death of Christ." To be sure of standing on solid exegetical ground it is better not to deny (with J. Weiss and B. W. Bacon) the saving significance of Christ's death (in the Synoptics) nor to assert (with Feine, Farmer, and scores of conservatives) "expiatory significance" or "perfect harmony with the Epistles in their stress upon the death of Christ." Luke merely paints Jesus as the suffering Redeemer who died because "thus it behooved" the Christ to suffer.

(4) *The cosmopolitan Christ is painted in colors.* While Matthew drew the lines of the Universal Christ, Luke deepened the colors in the lines of the Cosmopolitan Christ. Carpenter[135] devotes a whole chapter to "S. Luke the Universalist," and Hayes[136] calls his Gospel "The Gospel for the Gentiles." Robertson[137] calls "Luke a cosmopolitan." Because he was a cosmopolitan, in culture, tastes, and religion, he could see and

appreciate and delineate the cosmopolitan character of Christ. This he does in striking, brilliant colors. The Christ of Luke is the Saviour of the rich and the poor, of Zaccheuses and Bartimaeuses.[138] Robertson puts it pungently: "Christ calls the men from the bottom up. This is his crown of glory. There is no doubt about Luke being a democrat . . . a democrat who was striving for a spiritual aristocracy, not of money, not of blood, not of privilege, not of power, but of character, the brotherhood of the cross of Christ, that is still the hope of the world, the salt of the earth."[139] Yes, because "Luke was a democrat" he could appreciate and paint the class and racial democracy of Jesus who is the Saviour of men and women, rich and poor, of cultured and unlettered, of Jews and Samaritans, of Greeks and Romans, yea, of "all nations." Heinrici[140] is correct in claiming that the "peculiarity of Christianity consists in its being the religion of the human race," and that its universality depends upon "the historical facts of the sufferings and works of Jesus for redemption." Surely Luke has painted Jesus as the Cosmopolitan Christ on the ground that He is the suffering, redeeming Christ.[141]

(5) *The Lordship of Jesus.* Not only does Luke thirty times record the ascription by others of Lordship to Jesus, but seven times he himself gives Him the title Lord. He closes his portrayal with the resurrection and the ascension.[142] Mark alludes to the resurrection as a fact, Matthew presents the empty tomb and two appearances, but Luke paints the empty tomb as seen by a larger group of women and by Peter; His appearances to Peter; to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus, to the Eleven in Jerusalem, and again at the ascension near Bethany. The Christ of Luke is the Risen Lord. "And they worshipped Him, and returned to Jerusalem."[143] As Bishop Gore[144] has recently said, "His authority and lordship rest on the impression made by His person." Dean Inge[145] and Professor Fritzsche[146] accept the "miracle" of the physical resurrection of Jesus, though the latter admits it is "not mathematically to be proved." But Luke the man of science was convinced of His resurrection, and so accepted and painted Jesus as his Saviour and Lord, and the Saviour and Lord of all nations.[147]

8 *Resumé.*

(1) Luke has given us the first complete portrait of the

historical Jesus (although not directly even suggesting the eternal Christ of later Christology). His portrait paints the historical Christ from conception to ascension; from His personal entrance into earthly life and history to His personal retirement from its stage of action.

(2) Luke's portrait of Christ is the first symmetrical, well-proportioned picture of Jesus; a portrait beautifully blending the Divine and the human in His personality, emphasizing both as real and essential; a portrait brilliantly balancing the messianic functions, with no undue emphasis on either the wonder-working or the teaching, the redeeming or the reigning, Messiah.

(3) It is the first Christological effort to do full justice to the human historical Jesus; the Jesus who loves all classes and all races, the Healer of the sick, the succorer of the suffering, the friend of the friendless, the Saviour of sinners.

(4) Luke has transcended Q or Mark or Matthew in deepening the colors of the Divine Sonship of Christ. His Divinity suffers not a jot or a tittle in the stressing of His real humanity; but not a word is spoken by Jesus or by others, or written by Luke, in defense of an "eternal metaphysical sonship."

(5) Although not using the word "ransom," as did Mark and Matthew, still Luke stresses more than either or both together, the saving, redeeming function of the Christ. He is the "Saviour" (1:43, only time the word occurs in Synoptics) who died because His death was "necessary" (deî).

(6) The Christ of Luke is the universal Saviour and Lord. The universal note is struck by Matthew, but Luke almost makes it the key-note of his song of praise to the Divine-human Saviour.

(7) Thus Luke's portrait of Christ, though wanting many features of the Pauline Christology, pre-existence, essential Deity, creative activity, etc., yet with its peculiar emphasis upon the blended Divinity and humanity, the universal redemptive activity and Lordship of Jesus, it is an easy transition from Mark and Matthew to Paul and John.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VII

1. Life of Jesus, chap. I.
2. Quoted by Robertson, Luke the Historian '20, p. 56.
3. Lukas der Arzt '06, Apostelgeschichte, '07.

4. The Bearing of Recent Discovery, etc.; Pauline and other studies, etc.
5. ib.
6. For views of extreme liberals and their arguments, cf. Peake, ib. 124ff.; Moffatt, ib. 261ff.
7. See chapter I on Literary Sources (of Luke).
8. Cf. chap. I on Sources of Luke.
9. Cf. Plummer, ICC, p. XXIV f.; Bruce EGT, p. 445, for the independence of Luke and Matthew in their infancy narratives.
10. 1:1-4. 11. Les Evangiles Synoptiques, I. p. 260.
12. ib. p. 59. 13. Christianity according to S. Luke, pp. 177-180.
14. ICC, p. XXI ff.
15. ib. p. 225. 16. ib. pp. 189-202.
17. Art. Luke, Gospel of, Int. St. Bib. Enc.; cf. his Luke the Historian, chap. IV.
18. The eschatological school of J. Weiss, Bousset, Wrede Loisy, Father Terrell, et al; and the ethical school, so much more extensively championed, but especially cf. Harnack, What is Christianity? Kent, The Social Teachings of the Prophets and Jesus, chap. XXIII.
19. Cf. Milligan, N. T. Documents, p. 151.
20. Recent Discoveries in St. Luke's Writings, 1921.
21. 1:35 22. 2:52.
23. Cf. Plummer, ICC; Bruce, EGT.; Ragg, The Gospel Acc. to Luke, 1922; J. Weiss. Lk. in Meyer Series, for characteristics of Luke as a pen-painter.
24. 1:1-4. 25. Philology of the Gospels, p. 10.
26. Published by MacMillan Co., 1920.
27. So Moffatt, ib.; Burton, ib. (cf. chap. I.); Plummer, ICC, p. XXIII; Bruce, EGT. 44, 46f.; Allen, Aramaic Background of the Gospels, Oxford Studies, p. 293; Williams, N. T. Hist. and Lit., p. 70.
28. So Ramsay, Was Christ Born at Bethlehem? p. 74; Sanday, Expos. Times, XIV, p. 299; Harnack, Date of Acts and the Syn. Gospels, p. 155; Robertson, ib. p. 18 f.; all four apparently think Luke had a document which he verified by personal interviews.
29. Lukas der Arzt, '06, s. 69-75, etc.; Neuen Utersuch. zur Apos. Geschichte, s. 108 f.
30. Against the historicity of the birth-story, cf. Usener, Vorträge u. Aufsätze. 5 Geburt u. Kindheit Christi, '07; Soltau, Geburtsgeschichte Jesu Christi, '02, s. 6 f. 19 f.; Völter, Die Ev. Erzählungen von. d. Geburt u. Kindheit Jesus, Kritischuntersuch.. '11; Heyn, Immanuel, Jesus im Lichte Mod. Th. '07, s. Middleton, Murray. Jesus—Man of Genius, 1927. 10-36— on a Ms. he claims is older than the Vatican and Sinaitic: For its historicity cf. Orr, The Virgin Birth of Christ, chs. II and III, esp. pp. 239, 295, for views of others. Box, ib.; Vincent Taylor, ib.; Machen, Hymns of First Chap. of Lk. and Origin of First Two Chaps. of Lk. in Princ. Th. Rev. '12, 1 and 2, 1-38,

212-277; Fritzsche, Das Berufsbewusstsein, '05, s. 41, 53 ff.; Ramsay, ib.; Robertson, ib.

31. ib. p. 66.

32. In addition to above authorities, for and against, cf. bibliog. under Historicity, etc., ch. VI; cf. also Mackintosh, The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ, '12, 491 ff., who thinks the acceptance of the virgin birth not essential to proper evaluation of God in Christ; Leighton Parks, What is Modernism? ch. III, ditto, but much more emphatically states it; cf. Campbell, The New Theol. p. 97, who denies that it was a part of the early tradition. For the necessity of the virgin birth and the trustworthiness of the Lukan narratives, cf. Ramsay, Luke's Narrative of the Birth of Christ, Expos., '12, Nov. 385-407; Dean Inge, Outspoken Essays, '22; Gore, Belief in God, chs. 8 and 11, Belief in Christ, '22; Malden, Problems of the New Testament Today, '23; W. Lockton[5], The Resurrection and Other Gospel Narratives, etc. '24; H. W. Magoun, Messiah or Bastard—which? 1926.

33. ib. tr. p. 123.

34. J. Weiss, Luke, in Meyer Series, also thinks 1:35 is an "interpolation."

35. Bearing of Recent Discovery, p. 222; Was Christ Born at Bethlehem? p. 73 f. Cf. also his St. Paul the Traveller, pp. 2 ff. 20 ff. where he says Luke "commands excellent means of knowledge . . . . literary skill, and sympathetic historical insight."

36. ib. p. 263; cf. also Plummer, ICC, pp. XXIII ff.; Bruce, EGT. pp. 48 f. 37. ib. XLIII.

38. Eine Vorkan. Ueberlieferung d. Lk., etc., 1891. Cf. later his Jesus Christus und Paulus, '02, s. 149 ff., Paul exerted no influence on Mark, but little on Matthew and Luke; also his N. T. Th. 1910, and Einl. '13.

39. Luke, in Meyer Series.

40. Cf. Bruce, EGT, p. 48. 41. ib. p. 49.

42. ib. pp. 49, 50—argues that the absence of lutron and words of Jesus bearing on a theory of atonement proves this.

43. N. T. Theol. p. 45.

44. On the other hand, von Soden, Theol. Abhandlungen, s. 138, Weizsäcker, Apos. Age, vol. II; McGiffert, Apos. Age, et. al., are disposed to emphasize the Pauline influence. For undue emphasis of the Pauline influence in Luke, cf. Wrede, Das. Messiasgeheimnis, etc., '01; Wernle, Die Syn. Frage, s. 167; Piepenbring, Jesus Historique, '09, pp. 15-71; Robert Scott, The Epistles of Paul, '09; Bacon, Jesus and Paul, ch. VI, et al.

45. 1:1, "many"; cf. Jno. 21:25.

46. Cf. Bruce, ib., pp. 46 f.; so also, Burkitt, The Gos. Hist. and Its Transmission, p. 216; Jülicher, Einl, s. 371f.

47. 19:10; cf. the parables of "grace" in chs. XIV and XV.

48. Cf. ch. VII, "the woman who was a sinner"; ch. XIX, Zaccheus, "a man that is a sinner."

49. As Bousset, Wellhausen, Wrede, von Soden, Piepenbring, Bacon, et al.
50. As Stalker, The Christology of Jesus, 1899; Machen, ib., Sweet, ib., and all the "fundamentalists."
51. Of the types represented by Ramsay, Plummer, Bruce, D. Smith, Ragg, Robertson, B. Weiss, Harnack (with much reserve) Carpenter, Hayes, Milligan, Moffatt, Peake, et al.
52. Cf. Jülicher, Einl. s. 371, who says: "The Synoptists" (including Luke) "do not repaint but hand on the Christ of history."
53. Cf. Carpenter, ib. pp. 189-202, on "S. Luke, the Artist."
54. διδάσκαλος
55. 6:20-49. 56. As in chs. 10, 18, 23, etc.
57. Cf. HDB, and Int. St. Bib. Enc., arts. Matthew, Gos. of, Luke, Gos. of, and Parables.
38. 19:29 ff.
59. 21:27; cf. Plummer, Bruce.
60. Cf. Robertson, ib. ch. VII, on "The Medical Language of Luke."
61. 7:11 f. 62. Luke, so called by Robertson, ib. p. 130.
63. Luke the Physician, p. 187, note. 64. Cambridge Biblical Essays, p. 386.
65. ib. p. 83. 66. Luke the Greek Physician, p. 12.
67. Art. Miracles, in Int. St. Bib. Enc. 68. Was Christ Born at Bethlehem? pp. 71 ff.; Luke the Physician, p. 13, f.
69. ib. pp. 130 ff.
70. Cf. Ac. 16; 17, 26 ff.; 28:5, 9 f.; cf. Robertson, ib. pp. 133ff.; Wace, ib.
71. So Schmiedel, art. Simon Peter, Enc. Bib., on the draught of the fishes, 5:1-11.
72. 1:1. 73. 2:4-7.
74. Cf. Garvie, Handbook of Chr. Apol. p. 99 f. for emphasis on the Spirit's influence on Mary and through her on the "sinless" personality of Jesus.
75. See later discussion under 7 (6).
76. Cf. E. F. Scott, The Epistle to the Hebrews, 1922; Dods, EGT, ad loc.
77. Cf. Heb. 2:5-18. 78. 2:16ff., 27ff., 38 ff.
79. 2:52. 80. Jesus von Nazaret in seiner geschichliche Lebensentwicklung, 1906, s 4-6, 14 f.
81. Impf. tense emphasizing "linear" or continuous action—normal growth, physical and mental; cf. Robertson, Gramm. p. 883, f.
82. Cf. Plummer, Bruce, ad loc.
83. 2:41-54. 84. Bruce, p. 478.
85. Cf. 1:41, 67, 4:1. 86. 3:21. 87. 5:16. 88. 6:12.
89. 9:18. 90. 9:28, 29. 91. 11:1, 2. 92. 22: 41, 44.
93. Cf. Heb. 5:7-9, "He learned obedience by the things which He suffered"; cf. Deissmann, The Rel. of Jesus, etc., pp. 50 ff. for emphasis on the prayer life of Jesus.
94. 3:22, 4:3, 9, 41, 8:28, 9:35, 10:22, 22:70. (omits "Most High").

Cf. also the parable of the wicked husbandmen, 20:13, taken from Mark.

95. 3:38. 96. Cf. Robertson, ib., p. 157. 97. Cf. Robertson, ib. ch. XII, on "An Historian's Idea of the Deity of Jesus."

98. Which impairs the historical character of Luke.

99. As equivalent to Greek Θεοτης; cf. Trench, Syn. of N. T. sec. 2; Lightfoot, Com., Abbott, ICC, on Col. 2:9; cf. our ch. IV, on the Deity of Jesus in Q.

100. The "Elect One" is a messianic title in the Book of Enoch. Cf. Charles, Enoch, (Ethiopic) Book of, HDB; also his Eschatology.

101. 2:49; Cf. J. Weiss, Plummer, Bruce, Ragg, ad loc.; also Temple, The Boy Consciousness of Jesus, '22.

102. 10:22. 103. Cf. 5:21, where Jesus is represented by Luke as saying, "The Son of man hath authority on earth to forgive sins"; although the Pharisees accuse Him of assuming the rights of God, Luke does not represent Jesus as endorsing their language, nor does he do so himself. But cf. Robertson, ib. p. 160; cf. Jackson and Lake, ib. 400, who think Lk. stresses "physical relation" between Jesus and the Father.

104. ICC, p. 282. 105. Hase, Geschichte Jesu, s. 527. 106. Cf. ch. IV.

107. Jno. 1:1. 108. Jno. 1:3. 109. 1:1, 10:30, etc.

110. The word "redemption" occurs once, (21:28) but apparently in the eschatological sense (so Plummer).

111. 13:10-17. 112. 14:1-6. 113. 17:11-19.

114. 22:51.

115. 7:11-17. 116. 10:33 ff. 117. 1:43, 7:47; chs. 14 and 15, 23:43, etc.

118. 7:47. 119. Ch. 15. 120. 19:1-10. 121. 23:43.

122. Das. alteste Ev., '03; cf. Lk. in Meyer on 22:24.

123. Cf. Plummer, art. Lord's Supper, HDB, and ICC, ad loc.

124. 9:26, 44. 125. 24:25 f, 46 f. 126. ib. p. 219.

127. 17 times (Moult. and Ged.) 128. ICC, p. XXII.

129. ib. 236. Cf. also Bruce, EGT; Ragg, The Gos. Acc. to Lk. '22.

130. Akin to ἱλαρός, I Jno. 2:2, and ἱλάσκεσθαι, Heb. 2:17, and ἱλαστήριον, Rom. 3.25.

131. Cf. Plummer, Bruce, Ragg, ad loc.

132. Jesus Christus u. Paulus, 1902. 133. Th. Lit. Zeit. '04 1, 14.

134. The Death of Christ in the Synoptists, Rev. and Expos. Oct. '18.

135. ib. 212-227. 136. Syn. Gospels and Acts. pp. 205-216.

137. ib. p. 232.

138. Cf. 19:1-10 with 18:36 ff. and with 16:20 ff.

139. ib. p. 237.

140. Die Eigenart d. Christentums, '11; cf. also Holdsworth, The Christ of the Gospels, '11.

141. Cf. 24:47, the cosmopolitan program of Christ, with 24:46, the suffering Christ.

142. Ch. 24.

143. 24:52. 144. Belief in Christ, p. 46. 145. ib. chs. 8 and 11. 146. ib. s. 41, 53. 147. On the resurrection of Jesus, cf. bibliog. in ch. VIII. Cf. Jackson and Lake, ib. 408, who deny that Jesus during His ministry was called Lord; the idea is a later "synthesis of Jewish Christianity and Greek religions." Cf. ch. IX for views of Bousset, J. Weiss, et al.

CHAPTER VIII

FRAGMENTS OF CHRISTOLOGY IN THE EARLY CHURCH

In our opening chapter it was agreed that the Epistle of James, the early chapters of Acts (1-12, 15) and First Peter present, in the main, the Christ of the early church. Later on in this chapter will be noted the limitations of this general statement and the elaboration of the Christological idea as we advance from Pentecost to Paul.

1 *The Christ of the Epistle of James.* As to the authorship and date compare chapter I. Presumably James the half-brother of Jesus was the author of this pragmatic Christian document. If he is not, whoever wrote it, and however late may be the date, the Epistle reflects the Christology of the early church.

(1) *A Primitive Picture of the Christ.* As Sheldon[1] correctly says, "Whether later than Romans by a short or a long interval, the Epistle of James is associated with an early stage of doctrinal development."[2] Stevens[3] finds in it "no elaborate doctrine" of Christology. Beyschlag, it seems, expressed it rather too strongly:[4] "Christ had not yet become the central point of doctrinal thought." Sheldon[5] correctly accounts for the primitive Christology of James: "The predominance of the ethical interest over the theological may account, in part, for the paucity of reference to distinctively Christian aspects." Hayes is in accord with the facts when he writes,[6] "James says less about the Master than any other writer in the New Testament, but his speech is more like that of the Master than the speech of any one of them."

(2) *The Simple Features of the Picture.* In the salutation James expresses his faith in Jesus as the Messiah. Dale holds[7] that James, through information about Jesus from his mother, was converted before Jesus appeared to him,[8] but Patrick[9] thinks that James accepted Jesus as the Messiah because He

appeared to him after His resurrection.[10] At any rate, although once a scoffer at the messianic claims of Jesus,[11] he is now a "bond-slave (doulos) of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ."[12] His natural relationship of half-brother to Jesus is submerged in the higher spiritual bond of faith in the Messiah.

Jesus is "the Lord"; "the Lord of Glory."[13] Oesterley[14] thinks the word "glory" refers to the Hebrew Shekinah,[15] the visible presence of God, and so translates, "Have faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, the Shekinah," which he continues, is precisely the same thought that is contained in the words . . . . 'who being the effulgence of his glory' (Heb. 1:2-3); . . . . an expression of Divinity of our Lord."[16] So this is an emphatic expression of James' belief in the Divine Lordship of Jesus the Messiah. Especially does grammatical exegesis confirm this interpretation. James is the "bond-slave of God and the Lord Jesus Christ." By use of the conjunction "and" James places Jesus the Christ as "the Lord" in intimate relation to God.

Jesus bears "the beautiful name."[17] Again Oesterley is of opinion "the beautiful name"[18] is intended by James to signify "Jesus" (Savior). This expression, coupled with his exhortations,[19] "Have not the faith of (in or on)[20] our Lord Jesus Christ," etc., and the statement,[21] "What doth it profit, my brethren, if a man say, he hath faith, but have not works? Can that faith save him?" hints that James thinks of Jesus the Lord and Messiah as the object of "saving faith." Especially is this conclusion inevitable, if we press, as Oesterley does, the literal meaning of the "name" Jesus, Savior. However, James makes not a single reference to the death of Jesus and the idea of redemption through Him. Yet, James was not a dogmatist, but a pragmatist.

However, Jesus the Lord and Savior is also the Judge, though sharing this honor with God.[22] "Behold, the Judge (Jesus the Lord) standeth at the door."[23] "Only one (God) is the lawgiver and the Judge."

This is a primitive picture of the Christ but expresses the simple faith of the one time "scoffer" and emphasizes all the more, because of its simplicity and because it lacks the touches of the dogmatist, the power of the person of Jesus to impress the doubter and to transform him into a believer. This picture of the Christ is drawn twenty or more years after the sketcher first exercised his faith in Jesus as the Messiah. He has had

plenty of time to change his mind, but instead he writes to urge his suffering readers to "have faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the Shekinah, the expression of the glorious presence of God."

2 *The Christ of Acts* 1-12, 15. For the authorship and date and historicity of this account of the early church, compare chapter I. We shall assume that Luke is the painter but a perfectly trustworthy historian[24] who is drawing the Christ of the early church true to the sources before him which are both documents and information secured through personal interviews.[25]

(1) *Not an Artistic Picture.* Luke in Acts is not painting a portrait of Christ, as he was in the Third Gospel. He is merely recording, even with the Aramaic tinges of his sources reproduced, the actual Christ as the early Christians saw Him. He is not blending the views of Peter and Stephen, and others, into "a harmonious picture," as he did in the Gospel. He records the main impressions which the person of the risen Christ was making on the early church in Jerusalem.

(2) *Faith in Christ the Heart of Early Christianity.* Weinel[26] has forcefully expressed this fact: "Faith in Christ has become the new religion." They still believed in Jehovah the God of their fathers, and in the Old Testament as His word; but their faith in Jesus as the Messiah promised in those Scriptures and now fulfilling the redemptive plan of God "became their new religion." Christ *was* the primitive Christianity—the object of its faith, the centre of its creed, the inspiration of its program,[27]

(3) *The Early Christian Faith Rooted in the Teaching of Jesus.* Weinel asserts[28] that, because "Jesus considered Himself the Messiah," Christ had "become the new religion" for the early Christians. Piepenbring[29] also declares that the Christianity of the early church "arose from the original gospel of Jesus." Blunt[30] is still more explicit: "The moral wonder of Christ's personality is more significant than the resurrection in producing the new conviction"—that Jesus is the Messiah and Lord. His teachings impressed them that He was the Messiah; the "moral wonder of His personality" lent significance to His teachings; His resurrection convinced them of His lordship, and so heightened their impression of the "moral wonder of His personality," and gave authority to His teach-

ings. Seeberg[31] and Adeney,[32] and other ultra-conservatives overstate the agreement of the teachings of the early church with those of Jesus; the former claiming the early church had a "catechism" with a "formula of faith" in rigid conformity to the teachings of Jesus on "the ways," prayer, baptism, communion, etc.; the latter that "the teachings of the several apostles were in essential harmony with the life and thought of Christ." In spirit and religious principles, the early church was in "essential harmony" with Jesus' teachings but in content and scope they went beyond Him.

(4) *The Risen Christ the Centre of the Picture.* It was the Risen Christ who became the object of faith in the early church and the dynamic of their courage and zeal to suffer persecution and imprisonment for His sake. Even the extreme liberals who deny the physical resurrection of Jesus concede this. So Bacon[33] and Fögel,[34] Bowen,[35] and others. All those scholars who accept as a historical fact the resurrection of Jesus think Luke has placed the Risen Christ at the centre of the early church creed. So recently Orr,[36] F. B. Palmer,[37] J. M. Shaw,[38] Thorburn,[39] Denney,[40] Simpson,[41] Griffith Thomas,[42] and others. The Risen Christ is in the centre of the screen in Acts 1-12.[43]

(5) *The Redeeming Christ.* It is evident that Peter at Pentecost and afterwards presents Jesus as the Savior of penitent sinners. "Repent ye and be baptised every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins," etc.[44] "And in none other is there salvation; for neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, whereby we must be saved."[45] It is also evident that Peter and the early church, although having no clear conception of how it was so, came to recognize the death of Christ as a part of the Divine program for the messianic salvation. "Jesus of Nazareth . . . . being delivered up by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye by the hand of lawless men did crucify and slay; whom God raised up . . . . and hath made Him both Lord and Christ (Messiah), this Jesus whom ye crucified."[46] The phrase, "by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God," could scarcely mean anything less than that the death of Christ was understood by the Apostle Peter to be a part of the Divine program in setting up the messianic kingdom. Knowling[47] thus interprets: "In the Passion and

Resurrection of Christ, which at one time seemed to Peter impossible (cf. Mt. 16:22) he now sees the full accomplishment of God's counsel." Most exegetes interpret Peter's words to mean that the death of Christ (along with His resurrection) is a part of God's plan and as such has some relation to the securing of the messianic salvation. So Holtzmann,[48] Weizsäcker,[49] Weiss,[50] Stevens,[51] Sheldon,[52] Wendt,[53] Rackham,[54] Ropes,[55] Burton,[56] and others. On the other hand, Beyschlag,[57] Holsten,[58] McGiffert,[59] Dobschütz,[60] Preuschen,[61] either deny that Peter thought of the death of Christ as having any saving significance, or minimize the importance of His death in the messianic program, or at most, suppose that Peter merely thinks of it as the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy (so esp. Holsten).

The one title especially given to Jesus by the early church, "His Servant," "his Holy Servant,"[62] a reflection of Isaiah 53, emphasizes the fact that Jesus was understood by these early Christians to be the suffering Messiah and that His sufferings had something to do with securing the messianic salvation.[63] Moreover, the statement of Paul, I Corinthians 15:1-3, that the death and resurrection of Christ as the "first principles" of his gospel, were first "received" by him and then "delivered,"[64] at least suggests, if it does not prove, that the early Church, even before Paul, emphasized the death of Christ as a "first principle" in the new religion.[65]

(6) *The Reigning Lord.* If we accept the historicity of these early chapters in Acts, we must see that the early church regarded Jesus, not only as Messiah, the suffering Messiah, but also as the reigning Lord. The title "Lord"[66] is applied to Jesus in these chapters between thirty and forty times.[67] Several times it is referred to Jehovah God of the Old Testament,[68] which shows that Divine exaltation was ascribed to Jesus by the early church. However, Bousset[69] thinks the early church did not ascribe to Jesus the title Lord. They called Him the Messiah, the Christ. Paul afterward, under the influence of the pagan religions and of the Christians in Tarsus and Antioch, first called Jesus the Lord. But J. Weiss[70] thinks Bousset is wrong and that the early church recognized and worshipped Jesus as "the Lord." Professor Machen[71] has made out a strong case in favor of the Lordship of Jesus as a part of the early church Christology. Ropes[72] thinks their acceptance of

Him as Lord meant that the early church "could not stop" in the "gradual analysis of the problem . . . the slow definition of what was involved in this indefinite exaltation of the Messiah."

Only once,[73] and then as exalted at "the right hand of God," is He called "The Son of man." He is also called the "Holy and Righteous One,"[74] and "Prince of Peace,"[75] which terms although more or less messianic, put special emphasis upon the sinless character and exaltation of Jesus. But Orr[76] is pre-eminently correct in stating: "The change is seen in the growing substitution of the name Christ for Jesus . . . and in the habitual speaking of Jesus as Lord." The Lordship of Christ is at the centre of the picture in Acts 1-12.

(7) *The Personality of Christ as Reflected in these Titles.* While the Greek term pais is sometimes translated "child" or "son"[77] the chief emphasis in Acts is unmistakably placed upon the suffering Messiah.[78] The title, the Son of man, on the lips of the dying Stephen, while recognizing His humanity, puts the chief emphasis upon the exaltation of the Christ to the Father's throne. The title "Holy and Righteous One" points to His sinlessness. The title "Lord," especially used of Jesus in the midst of so many passages in which the term refers to Jehovah,[79] suggests that the early church ascribed to Jesus an unique Divine status. However, James Orr[80] seems to have over-stated the significance of the title as used by the early church: "He who was raised to the throne of Divine dominion; who was worshiped with honors due to God only . . . must in the fullest sense be Divine. There is not such a thing as honorary Godhead. In this is already contained in substance everything taught about Jesus in the epistles; His pre-existence, . . . His share in Divine attributes, . . . His share in Divine works, . . . in Divine Worship . . . Divine names and titles." When you remember that the title "Son of God," not to mention the title "God," is never, by the early church,[81] applied to Christ, it is easy to feel that Orr has gone beyond the legitimate results of historical criticism. The early church is not thinking so much of the relationship of Christ to the Father as of His station of lordly dignity and power, and so as the "giver"[82] of the Holy Spirit to endue them with power for conquest. This is not to say that the early church did not believe in the Divinity of Christ. They did accept Him as Di-

vine in a special sense. They worshipped Him as Lord. But they spent no time in trying to correlate His humanity and Divinity, His humiliation and exaltation. Their faith in Him as Messiah and Lord, although inspiring them to suffer for His sake and to proclaim His resurrection and Lordship, yet did not lead them to set forth a definite Christology. Sanday[83] correctly summarizes the christology of Acts 1-12: "The disciples had been in the habit of addressing their Master as Lord during His lifetime, in a sense not very different from that in which any Rabbi might be addressed by his pupils (Jn. 13:13 f.). But that sense is no longer adequate; the word has been filled with a deeper meaning. That 'Jesus is Lord' has become the distinctive confession of Christians (I Cor. 12:3, Rom. 10:9); where Lord certainly is 'the exalted Lord' of the Resurrection and Ascension (cf. Ac. 2:36)."

3 *The Christ of the First Epistle of Peter.*

(1) *Peter the Apostle Presumably the Author.* For a discussion of the authorship of this epistle, see Chapter I.[84] It is not who wrote the epistle that concerns us, but what kind of a picture of Christ did he paint? Who is the Christ of this epistle, and how does He compare, on the one hand, with the Christ of James and Acts 1-12; on the other hand, with the Christ of Paul?

(2) *Jesus and Peter.* Peter was one of the first disciples.[85] Early in the Galilean ministry Jesus called Him to the service of catching men for the Kingdom of God.[86] Toward the close of the Galilean period Jesus elicited from him the protestation of his faith in Him as the Messiah: "Thou art the Christ."[87] When the Master foretold His death, the impetuous Peter "rebuked" Him. Jesus, however, turned the tables on him and at once administered the stinging rebuke, "Get thee behind me, Satan; for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men."[88] On the night of the betrayal, when Jesus foretold the speedy scattering of the little flock, Peter again protested his loyalty to Jesus. "Although all shall be offended, yet will not I."[89] But the Master knew that before the cock should crow twice that morning, the impetuous Peter would have "denied Him thrice." After the resurrection Jesus appeared to Peter[90] and from that time on he never questioned the messiahship and Lordship of Jesus.[91] So, if Peter is the author of this epistle bearing his name, the writer had a personal knowledge

of the historical Jesus. His non-speculative Christology is ultimately grounded in a personal association with the actual Jesus and a spiritual fellowship with the risen Christ.

(3) *Paul and Peter.* But did not Paul influence, not only the writers of the Synoptic Gospels,[92] but also Peter the Apostle? Historically and psychologically it is easy to explain the influence of Paul on Peter. We know they met. Once Paul visited Peter and spent "fifteen days" with the early Apostle.[93] We know they met at the conference in Jerusalem.[94] Again we know they collided in Antioch, for Paul "resisted him to the face, because he stood condemned."[95] It is quite possible that they met at other times, in Jerusalem, in Caesarea, or in Rome. We also know that Paul was the greater personality. Especially was Paul, not Peter, the "master-mind" of the first century Christianity. As Hart says,[96] "There can be no doubt that of the Apostles of Christianity, who are known to us, St. Paul's was the master-mind." Again, he says,[97] "It is not derogatory to St. Peter to suggest that he may have been indebted to St. Paul." But notice, as Moffat has said,[98] "Instead of I Peter representing a diluted and faded Paulinism, it denotes an attitude influenced, but essentially uncontrolled, by the special ideas of Paul's theology." Peter may be indebted to Paul for his greater emphasis on the death of Christ (than in the speeches of Acts) and for his hint at His pre-existence; and yet he uses his impressions of Pauline teachings with a complete independence and an utter freedom from any Pauline "theologizing" tendencies.[99] As shown by Renan[100] and Wernle,[101] Peter's mind was not speculative. Naturally then, when coming in contact with the great thinker, Paul, although he was influenced by his thoughts, nevertheless spontaneously and unconsciously he absorbed the Pauline influence and, at the same time, used it in his own pragmatic program of comforting and encouraging suffering Christians, and of proving that the new religion, Christianity, is but the fulfillment of the Old Testament history and promises. So he conceived of all Christians as "priests" offering up the sacrifice of "praise" for the resurrection of Jesus;[102] as the "spiritual house," or temple, whereas the old temple was only a type.[103] Christians constitute the "holy nation," "the people of God," of which Israel was the historical type.[104] Jesus Christ is the real "lamb,

without blemish and without spot," for the redemption of the people of God.

(4) *The Suffering Redeemer.* Whereas in the speech at Pentecost Peter had seen the death of Christ as only a part of the divinely foreordained program of messianic salvation, in the Epistle he teaches that the people of God are "redeemed, not with corruptible things, with silver or gold . . . ; but with the precious blood of Christ";[105] that "His ownself bore our sins in His body upon the tree, that we, having died unto sins, might live unto righteousness; by whose stripes ye were healed";[106] that "Christ also suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that He might bring us to God."[107] As we have formerly written,[108] "Peter expressly declares that we are redeemed by the blood of the spotless Christ, thus giving the sacrificial significance to His death." As Beyschlag aptly writes:[109] "He explains the death of Christ to them as a fact of salvation from three points of view, that of example, that of redeeming power, and that of comfort against the sense of guilt."[110] Sheldon[111] correctly appraises Peter's view of the death of Christ, when he writes that he "places the chief stress upon the holy persuasion emanating from the death of Christ," but "there is no good reason to suppose that he ignored the objective aspect" (of redemption). While both contexts demand an interpretation which does full justice to the "example" of Jesus as an "incentive" to the suffering readers "patiently to suffer as Christians,"[112] at the same time the epistle asserts that "Christ suffered for sins . . . that He might bring us to God";[113] "His own self bore our sins in His body."[114] Weiss[115] thinks these expressions cannot mean less than that His "suffering the specific punishment of sin" is "the means whereby sin is removed, by which the stain of guilt has been effaced." This puts special emphasis upon the "objective" significance of Christ's death; namely, that Peter conceives of Christ in His suffering as doing something whereby God "removes the sin" and "effaces the guilt." Our conclusion, in the light of the context, the meaning of the terms used, and the probable historical development of Peter's Christological ideas, especially of his idea of the relation of Christ's death to the messianic salvation, is as follows:—

(a) Peter is not "theologizing"; he is not formulating any soteriological doctrine; he is not of a "speculative" mind and

his purpose in writing is pragmatic and not dogmatic. So it must not be asserted that Peter's picture of the suffering Redeemer sets forth the doctrine of "penal substitution." The literal or "resultant" meaning of huper must not be pressed too far.

(b) The chief thought in Peter's mind is that the innocent suffering of the patient Christ, as an "example," should spur the readers on to the same kind of patient suffering "as Christians."

(c) Yet, without a doubt, the picture paints the death of Christ as being "vicarious," as having some sort of "objective" significance, that in some sense He "bore our sins in His body," and that it was to "bring us to God."

(d) On the other hand, redemption itself must have, in Peter's mind, its "subjective" significance, for he says that Christ "bore our sins in His body on the tree, that we, having died unto sins" (having personally, by acts of the will separated ourselves from sins) "might live unto righteousness."

(5) *Christ the Risen Lord.* As in Acts, Jesus is called "our Lord," "and the Lord," and is to be set apart "in the heart" as such.[116] He is recognized as Lord because of His resurrection,[117] which has become the ground of a "living hope."[118] His Lordship is cosmic, extending to "angels and authorities and powers" which are subject to Him as He now sits "on the right hand of God."[119] This picture of His Lordship goes beyond the emphasis of Luke upon His glory in Ascension;[120] that is, Peter makes His cosmic Lordship more specific than Luke does. It goes beyond the vision of Peter[121] or of Stephen[122] in Acts.[123]

(6) *The Pre-Existent Christ.* While some New Testament scholars, Kuehl,[124] Hort[125] (with reserve), especially Beyschlag,[126] Weiss,[127] and Chase,[128] deny that Peter[129] teaches the actual pre-existence of Christ, many of them think he does —Schmid,[130] Lechler,[131] Bovon,[132] Holtzmann,[133] Stevens,[134] Moorehead,[135] Sheldon,[136] Hart,[137] Bigg,[138] Feine,[139] Weinel,[140] Gore.[141] Although Peter possibly thinks of Christ as existing prior to His earthly career, it is perfectly clear that he is not emphasizing the doctrine, as later did Paul, the author of Hebrews, John, and the author of the Apocalypse. He is blazing the hitherto untrodden path for the footsteps of the supreme quartet; he is extending the canvas for the brushes of

the master-painters of the New Testament Christology.

4 *The Christ of Peter, James, and Acts Compared.*

(a) James paints the simplest sketch. Jesus is the Messiah and Lord, the object of faith, and the Saviour.

(b) The picture of Acts 1-12 reproduces the features of His Messiahship and Lordship, but puts more emphasis upon His Saviourhood.

(c) The picture in First Peter surpasses the picture of both James and Acts in the deeper coloring of the lines of redemption and Lordship.

(d) Not one of these three pictures puts particular emphasis upon the personality of Christ—either His humanity or His Divinity. He is not called "the Son of God" in a single reference in these writings (except Ac. 9:20, ascribed to Paul). However, His resurrection, emphasized in both Acts and I Peter, and His pre-existence hinted in the latter, unmistakably reflect the faith of the early church in the unique Divine personality of Jesus Christ.

(e) The picture in Acts 1-12 and in the Epistle of James add nothing to the simple features of the historical Jesus pictured in the Logia, Mark, Matthew and Luke. They fail to emphasize the personality of Jesus, which is done more or less, in the early quartet of Christ-painters.

(f) However, the pictures in Acts and I Peter are in essential harmony with the portrait of Luke, in the emphasis upon the suffering Redeemer. I Peter surpasses Luke in stressing the relation of Christ's suffering to salvation.

(g) I Peter surpasses all the previous pictures of Christ in hinting at his pre-existence and in giving a striking description of His cosmic Lordship.

(h) I Peter is thus the connecting link between the Christologies of Luke and of Paul.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VIII

1. N. T. Th. p. 130. 2. On the other hand, cf. Harnack Chronologie, s. 486 ff., who thinks he sees in James the tone of teachings found in Hermas and other second cent. writers, and so places its date late and denies the authorship of James the brother of the Lord.

3. Th. of N. T. p. 288. 4. N. T. Th. I. 354. 5. ib. p. 153.

6. Art. James, Epis. of, Int. St. Bib. Enc.

7. Epis. of James, p. 5. 8. I Cor. 15:7. 9. James the Lord's Brother, p. 67. 10. Robertson, Prac. and Sc. Aspects of Christianity, p. 29, inclines to this view.

11. Jno. 7:2-5. 12. 1:1. 13. 1.1, 2:1; Cf. Warfield, "The Lord of Glory," who adopts this as the title of his monograph.

14. EGT, p. 436.

15. Cf., Friedländer, Patrische u. Talmudische Studien, s. 62 ff., for messianic use of term Shekinah; also Box, art. Hastings, DCG, II. 622.

16. So also Mayor, The Epis. of James, p. 78.

17. 2:7. 18. ib. IV, 439. 19. ib.

21. Objective Gen. Cf. Oesterley, ib.; Mayor, ib. Also Ropes, ICC. 21. 2:14. 22. 2:12, 5:9, 4:12.

23. So Oesterley, ib.; Mayor, ib.

24. For the discrediting of these chaps. cf. Schmiedel, En. Bib., Jülicher, Einl. s. 355. McGiffert, Apos. Age (though with caution), Blass, Acta Apostolorum, p. 8; for their historicity, cf. Chase, Credibility of Acts, p. 9 f.; Ramsay, St. Paul The Traveller, p. 8; Luke the Physician, p. 5; Harnack, Apostelgeschichte, 1908; Robertson, Luke the Historian, chaps. VI. and XIV; art. Acts, Int. St. Bib. Enc.

25. Cf. chap. I, on Sources of Acts 1-12. Cf. also Robertson, Luke the Historian, chap. VI.

26. Bib. Th. d. N. T., 1911. 27. Cf. Beyschlag, ib. I. 308.

28. ib. 29. Jesus et les Apotres, 1911.

30. The Acts of the Apostles, 1922, pp. 35-37.

31. Das Evangelium Christi, 1905. 32. Th. of N. T., 1911, pp. 120 ff.

33. The Resurrection in Primitive Tradition and Observance, AJ Th., '11, 3. pp. 373-402.

34. Das Rätsel des Todes u. des Lebens, 1921, s. 41, who claims the "soul and not the body is the subject" to be raised, in the thinking of N. T. writers.

35. The Resurrection in the New Testament, 1911. 36. The Resurrection of Jesus, pp. 6 ff. 37. The Resurrection of Jesus, Bib. Sac. July '16. 38. The Resurrection of Christ, 1920.

39. The Resurrection Narratives and Modern Criticism, 1910.

40. Jesus and the Gospel, pp. 111 ff. 41. The Resurrection and Modern Thought, 1910, pp. 45 ff, who asserts there is "no Christianity without faith in the resurrection."

42. The Resurrection of Jesus, Int. St. Bib. Enc.

43. Cf. 2:16-21, 31, 33, 36—because of the resurrection and ascension Christ has sent the Spirit; He is Lord, etc.

44. 2:38. 45. 4:12; cf. also chs. 10, 11, 15.

46. 2:22-24, 36; 4:28. Cf. Smith, Burton, and Smith, The Bible Doctrine of Atonement, 1909.

47. EGT, II. p. 83.

48. N. T. Th. I., 366. 49. Apos. Zeitalt. I.

50. Bib. Th. of N. T. I. 176. 51. Th. of N. T. p. 270 f.
52 N. T. Th. p. 145 f. 53. Apostelgeschichte, s. 93.
54. The Acts of the Apostles, on 2:23, 4:28.
55. Apos. Age, p. 67. 56. ib. 57. N. T. Th. I. 313.
58. Zur Ev. d. Paulus. 59. Apos. Age.
60. Apos. Age, 1909. 61. Die Apostelgeschichte, 1912.
62. Greek παῖς, 3:13, 26, 4:27, 30. Cf. Knowling, ib.
63. So Knowling, ib., Wendt, ib. Rackham, ib. ad loc. Cf. also Moffatt, Theol. of the Gospels, p. 145 f, for the influence of Isa. 53 on the thinking of the early church.
64. Greek παραδίδωμι, to hand down orally. 65. So Holtzmann, Weizsäcker, Stevens, Wendt, ib. above; cf. also Plummer, ICC, Bernard, EGT.
66. Greek Kupios; cf. Thayer; Abbott-Smith, for its various meanings. 67. 1:6, 21, 2:20, 21, 25, 34, 36, 39, 47, 3.19, 4:29, 33, etc. 68. 1:24, 3:22, 4:26, etc.
69. Kyrios Christos, 1923, pp. 99ff. Cf. Bacon, Jesus the Son of God, p. 50 f. who thinks Lord was a title of Jesus in the early church.
70. Christus, 1909, though he posits "Egyptian and Babylonian" influence on the early church in the ascription of the title Lord to Jesus.
71. The Origin of Paul's Religion, pp. 293 ff. Both Weiss and Machen use I Cor. 16:22, esp. the Aramaic term for Lord, to prove their contention.
72. Apos. Age, p. 71. 73. 7:56. 74. 3:14. 75. 3:15.
76. Art. Jesus Christ, Int. St. Bib. Enc., 1667.
77. So in Mt. 12:18; Wis. Sol. 2:13, 16, 18; Clem. Rom. I Cor. 59:2-4; Didaché, 9:2, 3, 10, 23; Clem. Alex., Strom. 7:1.
78. Cf. Holtzmann, Weiss, Wendt, Rachham, et al. above.
79. Cf. Warfield, The Lord of Glory, '07.
80. ib. above; Cf. also Mangenot, Jesus Messie et Fils de Dieu d'apres les Actes des Apotres, Rev. de Inst. Cath. de Paris, 1907, pp. 285 ff.
81. 8:37 being spurious; cf. Westcott and Hort, Text; also Intro. vol. II. p. 93 of App.; also Souter, Text and Canon, Chap. IX. 9:20 is put on the lips of Paul, and so not applicable here.
82. 2:37, "He hath poured forth this," etc.
83. Art. Jesus Christ, HDB, II. 648; cf. also Gardner, Evolution in Christian Doctrine, p. 88 f.; also his Modernity and the Churches, p. 232, where he speaks of the "earthly and heavenly life (of Jesus) as placed side by side, like the leaves of a diptych. On one tablet we see a human figure . . . . ; on the other a radiant spiritual being, crowned with glory seated high on a celestial throne."
84. Cf. also Peake, ib. 90 ff., Moffatt, ib. 331 ff.
85. Cf. Jno. 1:41 ff. 86. Mk. 1:17 ff.; Mt. 4:18 ff.; Lk. 5:2 ff.
87. Mk. 8:29; cf. Mt. 16:16, Lk. 9:20. 88. Mk. 8:33.
89. Mk. 14:29.
90. I Cor. 15:5, Mt. 28:16 f., Lk. 24:33 f.; cf. also Jno. 21:15 ff.

91. For further details, cf. art. Peter in HDB, Int. St. Bib. Enc., En. Bib.
92. Cf. chs. I, IV-VI. 93. Gal. 1:18.
94. Acts, 15:2, 6 ff. 95. Gal. 2:11.
96. EGT, V. 10. 97. ib. p. 10.
98. ib. p. 331; cf. Sheldon, ib. 271 f.; also McGiffert, Apos. Age, p. 485 f for a "direct association" of I Pet. with Rom. and Eph.
99. Cf. Bacon, Jesus and Paul, pp. 154 ff. for over-emphasis of Pauline influence on Peter; cf. also Pfleiderer, The Development of Christianity, ch. I.
100. Les Apotres, II. ch. V. 101. Synoptische Frage, s. 199 ff.
102. 1:3 ff.; 2:5, 9. 103. 2:5. 104. 2:9.
105. 1:19. 106. 3:18. 107. 3:18; cf. Bigg, ICC, on these passages, for the influence of Paul on Peter; cf. Moffatt, ib. p. 331, who denies any "theological" ideas to Peter, except in 1:10 f., 3:19 f.
108. Art. Sacrifice (in N. T.), Int. St. Bib. Enc.
109. N. T. Th. I., 395.
110. Cf. p. 396, ib., for his warning, however, against "the traditional theory of substitutionary penal sufferings by which the innocent sufferer delivers sinners, etc." On the other hand, cf. Robertson, Gram. p. 630 f. for the substitutionary significance of ὑπέρ, "for," in phrase, "the righteous for the unrighteous."
111. N. T. Th. p. 292.
112. Cf. 4:16 with 2:20, 21 . . . "patiently," "example."
113. 3:18. 114. 2:24.
115. N. T. Th. I., 233; cf. also Feine, Th. d. N. T., '10; Weinel, Bib. Th. d. N. T. '11; cf. also Bigg, ICC; Hart, EGT.
116. 1:3, 2:13, 3:15. 117. 1:3 ff. 118. 1:3, 3:21b-22a.
119. 3:22. 120. 24:51 ff. 121. 3:20. 122. 7:56.
123. Cf. Stevens, ib. pp. 307 f. for arguments pro and con as to the interpretation of 3:19 in which Peter refers to Christ as "preaching to the spirits in prison." Although Moffatt, ib. p. 331, refers to this as one of Peter's "distinctive theological ideas," any fair interpretation of the passage leaves the main lines of Petrine Christology unchanged.
124. Com. 125. Judaistic Christianity, 1894. 126. N. T. Th. I, 393.
127. Bib. Th. 128. Art. Peter, First Ep. of, HDB.
129. In 1:11. 130. Bib. Th. of N. T. p. 382. 131. N. T. Theologie.
132. Theologie du. N. T. 133. N. T. Theologie.
134. Th. of N. T., p. 300. 135. Art. Peter, First Ep. of, Int. St. Bib. Enc. 136. N. T. Th. p. 286.
137. EGT, Vol. V. (which cf. for views in Extra—Can. Jewish Lit.
138. ICC, ad loc.
139. Th. d. N. T. '10.
140. Bib. Th. d. N. T. '11.
141. Belief in Christ, p. 132, N. 2.

CHAPTER IX

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF PAUL

In the previous chapters we have been studying sketches and pictures, and one superb portrait, of Christ. But now we come to study a real Christology. Paul was the "master-mind" of first century Christianity, and could not help formulating, both for himself and his converts, a more or less well-defined Christology. However, it must be borne in mind that he did not take the time to write out a "system" of his doctrines, or even a systematic statement of his Christology. The nearest approach to the former is his theological masterpiece, the Epistle to the Romans.[1] The nearest approach to the latter is his christological masterpiece, the Epistle to the Colossians.[2] In his other epistles the finding of his Christology is to find the needle in the haystack.

1 *His Literary Sources.* For a more detailed statement of *why* we have accepted as the literary sources of the Pauline Christology the seven epistles whose genuineness is almost universally accepted by experts in the criticism of Pauline Epistles, see our chapter I. These epistles—I Thessalonians, Galatians, I and II Corinthians, Romans, Philippians, and Colossians—extend over three periods of the Apostle's Christian experiences and literary activities, covering a period of about twelve years, 51 to 63. These are the ripening years of the Apostle's thinking on Christology, which is the heart of his theology. These are the years in which his knowledge of Christ and his experiences "in Christ" are growing into maturity. It is a remarkable fact that we have no literary expression of Paul's Christology for the early years of his Christian experience and thinking (34-51), except that recorded by Luke.[3]

2 *The Historical Sources.* As we shall later learn, the Pauline Christology contains many features not found in the sketches and pictures of Christ previously studied, the main features of which existed (in their sources) prior to the publication of the Pauline Christology. Many features of the pre-

vious Christ-pictures are by Paul either omitted or slightly shaded or deeply colored, while many new features are developed and incorporated in this, the first real, Christology. Was he acquainted with the earlier Christ-pictures? Or, did he "evolve" out of his own Christian consciousness his "heavenly Christ"? Or, did he borrow from later Judaism, Alexandrianism, and the mystery religions the divergent features of his Christology?

(1) *The Old Testament a Minor Source.* Deissmann is strictly true to the facts when he declares "Paul a Bible Jew."[4] He was steeped in the Old Testament teachings, especially in its higher spiritual and messianic ideas and ideals. He knew thoroughly the messianic prophecies and as a Pharisee looked for the fulfillment of the same. But after his conversion he re-studied these messianic promises and interpreted them in the light of his experience in conversion. Although he rooted in the Old Testament his doctrines of justification by faith and election by grace, he is not so much indebted to it for his doctrine of the person and redeeming work of Christ. Yet, he sees in its sacrificial system, especially in the Passover Lamb, and in the Suffering Servant of Jehovah,[5] a foreshadowing of Christ who was "sacrificed as our passover"[6]; whose sacrificial death is a "first principle" in his gospel,[7] and "according to the Scriptures."[8] However, the Old Testament furnishes him only some thought-forms and a few expressions for the delineation of his suffering Redeemer. Many significant features of his Christology are scarcely suggested in the Old Testament.[9]

(2) *Literary and Contemporary Judaism.* While Paul's eschatology reflects his early Pharisaic views,[10] his Christology is the antithesis of the Pharisaic conception of the Messiah.[11] As to His Davidic descent and pre-existence most Pharisees and the Christian Paul are in agreement,[12] but, in the main, the Pauline Christology cannot be considered as a logical or natural development of the literary or Pharisaic messianic hope.[13]

(3) *Alexandrianism.* Professor Vedder[14] argues that the Christ of Paul is "not the historical Jesus, but an ideal Jesus, created out of the messianic hopes of his race and the philosophical ideas in the air." The latter are supposed to reach him by way of "Alexandrianism." J. Weiss[15] is more specific in his claims that Paul's idea of Christ as "the Spirit," and "the Creator"[16] was developed from Philo's logos doctrine. W. L. Walker[17] thinks Paul sets forth Christ (especially in Colos-

sians) as "the philosophical principle" of the cosmos, and not so much as the Redeemer; and so is following Philo. On the other hand, most scholars deny any considerable influence on Paul by the Alexandrian system of thought.[18] It is only in "form," or "expression," not in the content of his Christology, that Paul was thus influenced. Bacon is correct in thinking that Paul regarded Christ as the "Wisdom of God,"[19] not because of his "acquaintance with Philo or the Wisdom of Solomon," but "because as an educated Hellenistic Jew, converted by such an experience as his to belief in Jesus as the exalted Servant, the leader of Israel in its God-given calling to bring the world into reconciliation with God, it was inevitable that he should think of him as the agent of God in creation, revelation and redemption."[20]

(4) *The Mystery Religions.* In the last twenty years the pendulum of historical criticism has swung to the outer limit of the curve. Pagan philosophies and religions have been consulted to find the sources of Pauline Christology and Soteriology. Special honors have been awarded the mystery religions as sources of Paul's teachings. A quartet of German liberals, Reitzenstein,[21] Wrede,[22], Heitmüller,[23] and Bousset,[24] have led the extreme wing of historical critics.

Reitzenstein[25] claims that there is a "direct connection of Paul's thoughts and language with the Hellenistic mystery religions," although the influence is greater on his anthropology than on his Christology. Wrede[26] minimizes the influence of Jesus and magnifies that of the mysteries on Paul. Jesus is presented as Redeemer and not as Teacher. Heitmüller[27] emphasizes the connection between Paul's doctrine of mystical union with Christ and the mystery religions. He thinks the expression "in Christ," so often on the pen of Paul, is borrowed from the idea of the "deification of the mystic" by his initiation into the mysteries. J. Weiss[28] thinks that Paul's idea of mystical union with Christ is taken over from the mystery religions. Bousset[29] argues that Paul was influenced to call Jesus Lord, because the pagans called their gods "Lords"[30] and because Christians in Antioch, with Barnabas,[31] had already adopted the term for Jesus. He denies that Paul could have gotten the term or the idea from the early church, because they knew Jesus as the Messiah, the Christ, but not as the Lord. Paul's doctrines of redemption and mystical union with Christ

also receive large contributions from the Mystery Religions. Lietzmann[32] claims that the idea of a "World-Saviour" is in Vergil's Eclogues and that it was a common belief during the time of the kingdoms of Syria and Egypt. E. W. Meyer[33] claims that the "Adonis cult" in Antioch influenced Paul in the elaboration of his doctrine of "reconciliation by a dying and rising Redeemer." *Friedländer*[34] holds that his doctrine of "salvation by the death and resurrection of Christ" was derived from the pagan doctrine of a "dying and rising Saviour-God." Paul Gardner[35] thinks that the Apostle's doctrine of "a superhuman Messiah" was influenced by his knowledge of the mystery religions. Morgan[36] partially agrees with Bousset in claiming that the Apostle borrowed the title "Lord" from the "worship of Serapis as Lord." Kirsopp Lake[37] holds that the church at Corinth accepted "Christianity as a mystery religion and Jesus as the Redeemer-God who had passed through death to life, and offered participation in this new life to those who shared in the mysteries which He offered."[38] Case devotes eight chapters of his recent book[39] to a consideration of the sources and puts special emphasis upon philosophical speculation and "the mystery religions." Roy Wood Sellars[40] claims that when "Paul speaks of mysteries he is referring to the various secret cults which permeated the Roman World:" that "Tarsus was one of the chief seats of Mithraism, and it is practically certain that Paul was acquainted with its many rituals and beliefs." The above scholars are selected as examples of the modern tendency to trace the Christology of Paul back to the conceptions of the mystery religions.

On the other hand, just as notable an array of expert critics deny the real dependence of the Apostle on the conceptions found in the mystery religions. *Carl Clemen*[41] affirms that these religions had "not much influence on Paul"; that whatever influence there might be, it was only a contribution of "expressions" or terms, into which the Apostle put his own Christian content; that "one cannot speak of non-Jewish influences on Christology." That is, Paul may have been influenced by the mystery religions as to his use of "expressions" in anthropology, or other doctrines, but not at all in his Christology.

Brückner in his earlier book on Pauline Christology[42] places supreme significance on "the conversion" of Paul, which he says "is the starting point" for blending "the two contradictory

ideas," the Jewish idea of a "heavenly, pre-existent Messianic Being," and the "Christian idea of a crucified Jesus." But in his later book[43] he shows that the idea of "a dying and rising Saviour-God was wide-spread" in the first century A. D., and that Paul might have been slightly influenced thereby.

Cumont,[44] an expert in the history of religions, assumes that there is practically no influence exerted by the mystery religions either on "early Christianity or on Paul, because they were insignificant at that time." Manteil[45] denies that Paul's Christology was "developed from the contemporary world conceptions." Heinrici[46] is emphatic in declaring that Christianity is an "anti-mystery religion." Windisch[47] endorses this emphatic position by Heinrici. *Harnack,*[48] an expert in early Christian history, maintains that there is "no proof that any mystery cult had any influence on Christianity, at least until the end of the second century"; especially that "in the East where Christianity appeared Mithras did not appear." *Feine,*[49] critic and theologian of the New Testament, denies any influence of the mystery religions on Paul, but declares that "his doctrine of Christ rests on Matthew 11:27=Luke, 10:22." *Weinel,* one of the latest writers of a New Testament Theology,[50] concedes that Paul may have borrowed from this source for his doctrine of "the sacraments of the church," but not for his doctrine of "mystical union with Christ, on the ground that "fellowship with God is physical in the mystery religions; in Paul (and John) *ethical.*" Even Pfleiderer,[52] though giving prominence to the science of the history of religion, refuses to claim that any pagan religions had much influence on Paul either as to his doctrine of the person of Christ or the doctrine of reconciliation through His death. "On the other hand, it would be a serious error did we attempt to derive the general conception of the Divine Sonship of Christ from some definite pre-Christian legend; indeed in some sense or other their conception is the common property of the religious humanity of all the ages; . . . . it has its ultimate source in the depths of the religious consciousness."[53] Anrich[54] declares there is "no conscious adoption of the forms or institutions of the mystery religions." De Jong[55] comes to practically the same conclusion. Goguel,[56] though admitting influence from "the Hellenistic ways," thinks mainly of Gnosticism and not the mysteries as "influencing the Apostle Paul."

Lindbloom[57] shows that to Paul "life is an inner spiritual quality expressed in religious and ethical activities," while in the mystery religions it is "a *divine immortal* substance." Wernle[58] argues pointedly that Paul could not have found his doctrine of the cross in Corinth[59] "foolishness unto the Greeks," if there had existed a common belief in "a dying and rising Saviour God." Deisner,[60] very recently, has sought to demonstrate that "parallels are not proof of dependence; some things above the experience of the world have their origin in the supernatural world."

Among the British and American scholars who either deny or minimize the contribution of the mystery religions to the Pauline Christology, may be mentioned the following:— Ramsay[61] admits that Paul's Christology was possibly influenced thus as to "terms." Mackintosh[62] thinks there is "no causal relationship at all" between the conceptions of the mystery religions and the Pauline Christology. Moffatt[63] and Garvie,[64] though recognizing slight influences from this source, put the chief emphasis (apart from his experience) on the "Jewish" contributions to his "gospel" and "theology." Maurice Jones[65] thinks Paul received "not much from the mystery religions." So have Kennedy[66] and Angus[67] expressed themselves, the latter emphasizing the fact that Christianity conquered the mystery religions because of its doctrine of the person of Christ and the believer's personal fellowship with Him. Patterson's[68] thesis in his recent book is the "presentation of the essential inner differences of Christianity from Mithraism" and the likenesses incidental and external." Headlam[69] claims there is practically no hellenistic influence in "Pauline Christianity." Sheldon,[70] Machen,[71] and Robertson[72] reduce to the minimum the influence of the mysteries on Paul. The correct statement seems to be: "It is quite possible that Paul took up some of the phrases of these mystery religions, and gave them a richer content for his purposes."[73]

(5) *Early Christian Tradition.* Most scholars think there was a historical connection between Paul and Jesus and the early church. Feine[74] thinks of Paul as expanding his Christology out of the words of Jesus in Matthew 11:27 (=Lk. 10: 22). Jülicher[75] lets the Pauline Christology rest "on the early church" view of Christ. J. Weiss[76] claims the Lordship of Jesus in Paul may be derived from the views of the early church.

Royce[77] emphasizes early Christianity as a source of Pauline Christianity. E. F. Karl Müller[78] emphasizes the use of the title "Lord" by the early Christians; claims that Jesus was "the object of worship" among them; so Paul did not invent or borrow from pagans the doctrine of the Lordship of Jesus. Beyschlag[79] magnifies the points of contact between Jesus' teaching and that of Paul. Resch[80] presents and magnifies "the parallels between the sayings of Jesus and the words of Paul." Of course, it goes without saying that most of those scholars who magnify the pagan contributions to Pauline Christianity[81] minimize the dependence of Paul on Jesus and the early church.

(6) *His Experience.* The originality of Paul is conceded by all, and his experience as the primal shaping force of his Christology in particular and of his theology in general is emphasized by most modern experts on Paul. Deissmann[82] speaks of Paul as a "religious genius," "a hero of piety," and his experience of "communion with Christ as the central matter." Weiss[83] thinks Paul's contention in Galatians, chapter one, precludes "the possibility of any human influence in the forming of his gospel." Sabatier[84] and Goguel[85] trace "the development of his doctrine" to his "experience" in and after conversion. Feine[86] conceives of the Apostle's Christology as an expansion of the claim of Jesus in Mt. 11:27, under the modifying influence of his experience. Wm. Mundle,[87] though admitting the "syncretistic" quality of "Paul's religion," puts the chief stress upon the "power" of his "personal thought and religion." Brückner[88] declares "the conversion of Paul" to be "the starting point" of blending into his unique Christology "the contradicting ideas" of a "heavenly Messiah" and "a crucified Jesus." Mackintosh[89] speaks of "redemption as an experience," which is the essence of the superiority of Christianity. Both Stevens and Sheldon regard the conversion of Paul as the mightiest shaping force of his Christology. The former says:[90] "His temperament, education, religious experience as a Pharisee, and peculiar conversion have an obvious and easily traceable effect upon his work and his theology . . While his gospel was divine in its origin and came to him by revelation, it was also subject to reflection and development in its definition and application."[91] Sheldon says;[92] "With the revelation of the risen Christ came the vision of the new and better method. What he could not achieve by the way of self-subjection to the

law he found attainable by faith upon Christ . . . By natural sequence he regarded Him as not merely the Jewish Messiah but the world's Saviour. He was true to the lesson of his experience in that he gravitated into a theology Christo-centric and world-embracing in outlook."

Paul's experience after conversion was the logical sequence of his conversion. His conversion was a climacteric crisis of a series of preparatory steps, including especially his belief as a Pharisee in righteousness as a human achievement by means of obedience to the law; his noble personal ideal "to do good"[93] and to attain unto a "righteousness"[94] which would make him "blameless"; his struggle through the weeks, or perhaps months, of persecuting the Christians, on the one hand, and on the other, of reflecting upon their peace of mind by faith in Christ, their deathless devotion to His "name," and their sacrificial living and dying as witnesses to His resurrection.[95] So when he committeed himself "by faith" to "Jesus," whom he was persecuting in the person of His followers,[96] he was convinced of His "resurrection," and His resurrection proved to him His messiahship and Divine Sonship.[97] His Lordship was conceded in his surrender to Him as "a bond-slave,"[98] but doubtless grew on the Apostle as more and more he experienced that sublime "mystical union" with Christ according to which he could say,[99] "I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me; and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself up for me."[100] So it can be easily demonstrated that the chief elements in the Pauline Christology were developed, by reflection and personal fellowship with the Risen Christ, out of his experience in and after his conversion. In this way were developed the doctrines of messiahship and Divine Sonship, the Lordship and Deity (including pre-existence) of Christ, "redemption" and "reconciliation" by Christ.

3 *The Pauline Portrait of Christ.* We cannot speak of the Pauline portrait of Christ as "a harmonious whole," or "a symmetrical picture," as was the portrait painted by Luke.[101] While Luke was a historian and an artist, Paul was a thinker and a theologian. So in the Pauline portrait we may look for a theological rather than the historical Christ.

(1) *The Historical Jesus.* It is correctly assumed by most

critics that Paul starts with the "heavenly Christ" and not with the historical Jesus.[102] The extreme liberals, J. Weiss, Bousset, Wrede, Schmiedel, Lagrange, Bacon, Case, and others,[103] unduly minimize the connection between the historical Jesus and the Pauline Christ. Men like Feine[104] and Weinel[105] in Germany; Garvie[106] and Ramsay[107] in England, Sheldon[108] and Robertson[109] in America, while not taking the extreme view that all we find in the Epistles of Paul is first contained in the Synoptic Gospels, maintain that Paul does not ignore the historical Jesus. Yet, it is evident that the Pauline Christology is a distinct step forward in the evolution of New Testament Christology.

From the Epistles of Paul we may construct a simple life of the historical Jesus[110]: He was born of a Jewish woman, "under the law";[111] He was of the Abrahamic stock[112]; of the royal lineage of David[113]; yea, He had an unique birth in that He was sent only in the "likeness of sinful flesh,"[114] and not in actually sinful flesh; His experiences in life were without sin and His character sinless[115]; He lived an unselfish life[116]; He was an ethico-religious teacher with some of whose teachings Paul was familiar[117]; His institution of the Lord's Supper[118]; His betrayal[119]; His death and resurrection, and the post-resurrection appearances, some recorded in the Synoptics, some not[120]; His ascension (at least strongly implied).[121]

The possible sources of Paul's knowledge of the "historical Jesus" are in evidence in our literary sources: His fifteen days with Peter in Jerusalem three years after His conversion[122]; association for at least three years with Barnabas, a member of the church in Jerusalem[123]; general Christian tradition[124]; association for several years with Luke the historian who in Paul's lifetime was likely gathering material for his books.[125] Possibly Paul was acquainted with some documents like the Logia[126] from which he culled the sayings of Jesus like that recorded in Acts 20:35, "It is more blessed to give than to receive."

(2) *The Divine Sonship of Jesus.* Bishop Gore[127] speaks of Paul as "the first to call Jesus the Son of God." According to Luke,[128] immediately after his conversion he "proclaimed Jesus that He is the Son of God." In his epistles fourteen times he refers to Jesus as "the Son of God," "the Son," "His Son," or "the Son of His love." Only once in the early epistle does

he speak of "waiting for His Son" from heaven.[129] But in the Great Epistles he calls Him Son eleven times: six times in Romans,[130] thrice in the Corinthians,[131] twice in Galatians; and twice in the Imprisonment Epistles.[132]

What content did Paul put into this title? Is it merely the equivalent of Messiah? Is He Son only, or primarily, in an official sense?[133] Or, is He Son by "adoption"?[134] Or, is He the Son of God in an "ethical" sense; that is, He is like God in character and life?[135] Or, is He called the Son because He is "the elect object of Divine love"?[136] Or, is He the Son in the sense of "essential" kinship with Deity? The last view has been held by most scholars since the days of Athanasius.[137]

The term "first-born"[138] seems to suggest at least, if it does not signify, His "priority" in existence to "all creation." It is so held by Immer,[139] von Soden, Lightfoot, Abbott, Peake;[140] by the recent lexicographers, Thayer,[141] Abbott-Smith[142]; by Stevens,[143] Sheldon,[144] and others. On the other hand, many exegetes, as Haupt, Oltramare, Eadie, Hofmann, and Weiss[145] hold that the term "first" means "only sovereignty," and so does not necessarily signify the personal pre-existence of the Son in a "metaphysical" sense. However, the context, which speaks of "all things" being created through Him (v. 16), points unmistakably to His existence "before" the creation.

The expression, "in the form of God,"[146] according to Lightfoot[147] and Kögel,[148] add weight to the idea of an eternal Sonship, although Vincent[149] thinks Paul could not be using the term in the metaphysical sense, inasmuch as he is writing for a practical purpose to urge his readers to follow the "example" of Christ. The term "image" in the phrase, "the image of God," as predicated of Christ,[150] since it also denotes the image of God in man[151] and the image of Adam in man,[152] sheds little light for the solution of the problem. Most scholars think of Paul as regarding His Divine Sonship as the basis of His messiahship.[153] They also think of the Divine Sonship as accounting for the sinlessness of the historical Jesus. So have interpreted Weiss,[154] Stevens,[155] Thayer,[156] Briggs,[157] Loofs,[158] and Sheldon.[159] That is, Paul based the sinless character and the messianic function of Jesus on His Divine Sonship.

(3) *The Deity of Christ.* Three passages in the seven epistles accepted in chapter I. deserve our consideration— I Corinthians 8:6, Romans 9:5, and Colossians 2:9. In the Corin-

thian passage "the one God, the Father," and "the one Lord Jesus Christ" are respectively the "source" and the "medium" of the creation of "all things."[160] The Father is the ultimate "source," the Son is the meditating Creator of "all things." But the two prepositions used, put a wide chasm between the Father and Jesus Christ; the former is the ultimate Creator, the latter the agent or mediating Creator.[161] But in the Colossian passage Paul asserts: "For in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Deity (Godhead) bodily." Lightfoot[162] and most conservative scholars contend that in spite of the "self-emptying" at the incarnation, "the fulness of the Deity" continues to dwell in Christ even in the incarnate body, although under limitations. Many liberals limit "the fulness of the Deity" by interpreting "bodily" to refer exclusively to His "glorified body." But ancient and modern scholars, lexicographers,[164] exegetes,[165] and New Testament theologians,[166] are agreed that the Greek word[167] for "Godhead" means more than divinity, and nothing short of "Deity." The tense of the verb is "present" and denotes "linear," or continued, action.

But does the word "God" in the doxology of Romans 9:5 refer to Christ? Many textual critics[168] so punctuate it that it refers to God and not to Christ. On the other hand, many so punctuate it that it refers to Christ as "over all, God blessed forever."[169] So did most of the early fathers read it;[170] most reformers;[171] so do many writers of New Testament theologies,[172] and most exegetes. [173] The arguments against its reference to Christ are:— (a) Comparative exegesis shows Paul nowhere else calls Christ "God"; (b) doxologies to God in the midst of significant discussions occur elsewhere in Paul; (c) the context is emphasizing the tragedy of Israel's rejection and not discussing the person of Christ.[174]

The arguments for referring the doxology to Christ (in answer to above) are:— (a) Paul elsewhere ascribes to Christ the functions of Deity, pre-existence, creation, etc.;[175] (b) a doxology to God and not to Christ breaks the line of thought;[176] (c) also two points in grammar: the article and participle naturally go with a preceding substantive rather than the one following; and "blessed" usually precedes "God" in doxologies.[177] Hence, on the whole, though the argument is not as convincing as a demonstration in geometry or a test-tube proof in the laboratory, we conclude that the line of thought in the

context; that the grammatical usages as to the position of the articular participle with the substantive modified, and the usual place of "blessed" in a doxology; and the ascription elsewhere by Paul of the functions of Deity (creation and sustaining the universe)[178] and the dominion and lordship over the cosmic powers,[179] all logically point to the actual Deity of Christ the Son. That is, the title Son of God as applied to Jesus, in the light of Paul's experience and reflection, has expanded its meaning from the simple messianic to an eternal personal significance.

(4) *The Pre-existence of Christ.* This is a logical deduction from His "essential" Deity or "metaphysical Sonship." If in "essence" He is Deity, He must be the eternal Son. The expositors agree that Paul set forth the pre-existence of Christ in some form.[180] But in what form? Beyschlag[181] represents the extreme view that it is an "ideal" and not a personal existence. A few like Baur,[182] Biedermann,[183] Holsten,[184] Hilgenfeld[185] and Pfleiderer[186] think Paul teaches that Christ existed in a pre-incarnate state but only in a "human" form.[187] But most modern and practically all ancient and mediæval New Testament scholars think he taught the pre-existence of Christ in Divine form. The grounds for this belief are Pauline expressions like these: "God sent forth His Son"[188]; "Though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor," etc.;[189] being in the "form of a servant"[190]; "He is the first-born of all creation"[191]; "He is before all things"[192]; "all things have been created through Him and unto Him"[193]; "being on equality with God."[194] Here must be classified most exegetes[195] and writers of New Testament theology,[196] although they represent varying shades of opinion as to details. Ramsay[197] is emphatic in his contention that science (or Biblical scholars influenced by the criteria and conclusions of science) has *"no right"* to deny the pre-existence, virgin birth or resurrection of Christ.

(5) *Christ the Suffering Redeemer.* Paul conceives of this eternal Son of God as being "born of a woman" that through His death He might procure man's redemption,[198] and through His redemption "reconciliation" between God and man.[199] Observe, Paul has called Christ the Son in Romans 1:4 before he thinks of Him as the Redeemer and Reconciler in Romans 3:24 f. and 5:10. Note also that Jesus Christ was presented

by Paul to the Corinthians as "the Son of God" (2 Cor. 1:19) before He was presented as the Redeemer and Reconciler (2 Cor. 5:18). The same is true of the Colossian Christology. In 1:13 He is "the Son of His love." In 1:14 "we have redemption through His blood." Verses 15-17, introduced by a "for" (gar) clause, take Christ back to eternity as "the first-born," the one "before all things," the mediating Creator. In other words, His person as God's Son and Creator of the cosmos is behind His redeeming work.[200]

It is to be noted that Paul is the first to use the word "cross" to signify the death and sufferings of Christ.[201] Peter used the term "tree"[202] to describe the crucifixion. Crucifixion was a Roman method of punishment and involved the deepest shame. And yet the Apostle seized upon this ignoble term as the symbol of his gospel of redemption through Christ's death.[203] It was the "Lord of glory" whom the "rulers of this age" crucified.[204] But the dignity of the person, the eternal Son of God and mediating Creator of the cosmos, and the magnitude of the design of His death, the redemption and reconciliation of man to God, converted the shame of the cross into the glory of God. "We preach Christ crucified . . . Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God."[205]

(6) *The Lordship of Jesus.* But especially does the Apostle delight to think of Jesus as "the Lord of glory."[206] The term "Lord" referring to Christ occurs 32 times in Romans, and 50 times in I Corinthians, while it is fairly common in the other doctrinal epistles.[207] He continues to use it copiously in Philippians[208] and Colossians.[209]

What is the meaning of the term on Paul's pen? First of all it means the Lordship of Jesus over the individual Christian. So he calls himself "a bond-slave,[210] and other Christians "bond slaves of Christ."[211] This Lordship is grounded on redemption by the death of Christ. "Ye are not your own: ye are bought with a price; therefore, glorify God," etc.[212] But Christ is also Lord of all. "For the same Lord over all is rich toward all them that call upon Him."[213] He is the Lord of all, both "things in heaven, on earth, and under the earth."[214] However, this universal cosmic Lordship is not ascribed to Him, until He reaches the state of exaltation, which He receives as a "gracious gift"[215] from the Father, because of His humiliation in incarnation and His death on the cross.[216]

Does the title signify Deity? In Romans 10:12 the title refers to Jesus, in 10:13 to Jehovah (as quoted from the O. T.). Warfield,[217] Machen,[218] Gore,[219] and others,[220] have argued that this passage contains at least an intimation of the Deity of Jesus. In I Corinthians 2:8 "the Lord of Glory," according to Findlay,[221] is "no synonym for Christ's Godhead," but "signifies the entire grandeur of the incarnate glory." While Phil. 2:11 describes Christ's ascension glory, 2 Cor. 2:8 refers to the "glory" belonging to His incarnate state. Menzies[222] aptly says: "The Divinity of Christ is the centre of Paul's thought." Now since this title Lord occurs in his epistles over 100 times, it must denote to him "the Divinity of Christ," or else "the Divinity of Christ" is not the "centre of his thought."

The Lordship of Jesus includes His headship "over all things to the church."[223] The basis of this headship or Lordship is His cosmic relations and activities,[224] and His redemptive work.[225] He is Lord of the church, because He is the "first born of all creation," "He is before all things." He created all things, and redeemed the church through His blood. This headship means He has authority to control the church and the individual Christian.[226]

This Lordship of Jesus depends upon His resurrection which shows Him to be the Son of God with cosmic relations and redemptive efficacy. If He has not been raised, faith is an empty thing, preaching is a lie, He cannot forgive sins, our hope in the future life is a delusion.[227]

(7) *The Subordination of the Son to the Father.* Christ is subordinate in that in His cosmic activities He is only the mediating agent of God. His Lordship over the cosmos is the "gracious gift" of God.[228] In His redemptive work He was "sent," had to submit to "self-emptying," must become in form a human slave and submit to the death of the cross.[229] Yea, in all the tragic or sublime acts of redemption and reconciliation He is only the mediating agent,[230] while the whole process of salvation is traced back to God's love for sinners. However, this subordination involves not the slightest hint at His ethical inferiority to God. He "knew no sin"[231]; that is, He never once experienced sin.[232] He pleased not Himself but did God's will.[233] He loved as the Father loved and sacrificed His life as "God in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself."[234] Yet, Paul never argues from the sinlessness of Jesus to His Di-

vinity or Deity. He is not thought of as Divine because He is sinless. However, he argues from His sinlessness to the efficacy of His redemptive sacrifice. Because "He knew no sin" He was "made sin for us.[235]

Also Paul conceives of a sort of subordination of Jesus to the Father in the very term "Son." As Son of God, even in the pre-incarnate state He was only "in the form of God."[236] He never applies the term "God" to Him in the pre-incarnate state, as John does.[237] Yet, He was "equal with God"[238] or "on an equality with God."[239] He was "equal" to God in Divine nature, moral excellency and perhaps in essence, but subordinate in personal relationship and in cosmic and redemptive activities. Moreover, Paul conceives of Christ, at the Parousia, as "delivering up the Kingdom (Messianic) to God even the Father . . . . . "Then shall the Son also Himself be subject to Him that did subject all things unto Him, that God may be all in all."[240]

4 Resumé and Comparison.

(1) Paul, although reproducing many familiar features of the Synoptic, Jacobine and Petrine portraits, as the historicity and humanity of Jesus, His Messiahship and Lordship, His universal redemptive activity based upon the dignity of His Divine-human personality, makes a bold and marked step forward in the formulation of a scientific and philosophical Christology—scientific in that it grows out of the facts of the Jesus of history and the Christ of experience; philosophical in that it is the effort of a "master-mind" to explain the unique person and the redemptive work of Jesus the Christ.

(2) The experience of Paul in conversion and in communion with Christ as his Lord and Redeemer is the paramount shaping force of his Christology. His deepest aspiration of soul was to "know Him"[241] (experimentally)[242] "and the power of His resurrection." To a wonderful degree he realized this spiritual ambition. He "knew" the "heavenly Christ," "the Lord of glory," as few men of his or any other times have known Him. The Old Testament promises, the Pharisaic doctrine, the Alexandrian philosophy, and the mystery religions, furnished a few "thought-forms" and a few "terms," while Christian tradition contributed the facts of the historical Jesus, but his experience of Christ as Redeemer and Lord filled to the brim those forms and terms and developed the picture of the historical

Jesus into the glorified figure of the "heavenly Christ," the reconciling Redeemer and the reigning Lord.

(3) As compared with the Synoptic pictures Paul stresses the "heavenly Christ," while they emphasize the earthly Jesus; and yet the Christ of heavenly glory is latent in the lines of the Synoptic pictures, and the Jesus of history furnishes a concrete personality as the foundation of the heavenly Christ of Paul.

(4) As compared with the portrait of Luke the Pauline Christ is not so well proportioned and symmetrical, not so harmonious and artistic. The Pauline Christ is a little one-sided in that Paul does not, as Luke does, paint in colors the human, historical Jesus.

(5) As compared with the early church pictures of Christ, while they deepen the colors of the suffering Messiah and the reigning Lord, Paul outdoes them in painting the reconciling, suffering Redeemer, but out of his originality and rich experience he paints in ever deepening colors the Divine and Heavenly personality of the Christ. To Paul the Jesus of history and the Christ of his experience was the eternal Son of God, "the first-born of all creation," the creative principle and the mediating Creator of the cosmos. Yea, He was "on an equality with God," He was "God," before He was "born of woman"; even in His incarnate state and now exalted at the Father's right hand "in Him all the fulness of the Deity abides." While Q, Mark, Matthew, and Luke take for granted, and in a way, seek to prove this unique relation to the Father, Paul paints the Christ of eternity, past and future, who is the eternal Son of God.

(6) As compared with the portraits of Luke and Peter, the nearest approaches to real Christologies prior to the Pauline Christology, Paul elaborates the pre-existence of Christ which Peter barely intimates; surpasses Peter in ascribing to Christ a universal cosmic Lordship; equals Luke in emphasis upon the redeeming function of Christ the Savior, but far outdoes him in emphasis upon His death as the medium of redemption and reconciliation; surpasses even Luke in painting Christ as the universal Savior of sinners, wise and foolish, bond and free, male and female.

(7) The Pauline Christology has prepared the way for the culminating Christologies of Hebrews, John and the Apocalypse.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IX

1. Cf. Godet, Intro. to Com. on Rom., who contends that this epistle was written as a "compend of Pauline theology."
2. Cf. Moffatt, ib. 151: "Its dominant aim is to restate the absolute adequacy of Jesus in relation to the world and to the church, etc."
3. Acts 9:20, 22, "He proclaimed Jesus, that He is the Son of God," which means that Paul is "proving that this is the Christ" (9:22).
4. Paulus, '11; St. Paul; A Study in Social and Religious History, '12. 5. Ex. 12, Isa. 53. 6. I Cor. 5:7.
7. I Cor. 15:3; cf. Plummer, ICC, Bernard, EGT. 8. I Cor. 15:3
9. Similar view held by Weiss, Bib. Th., vol. I, pt. III.; Beyschlag, N. T. Th. II. 12-24; Stevens, Pauline Th., p. 67 f.; Sheldon, N. T. Th. p. 192 f.; on the other hand, cf. Pfleiderer, Das Urchristentum, zw. Aufl. '02, s. 153 f., for extreme emphasis on O. T. influence on Paul. Cf. Immer, Th. d. N. T. s. 247-257, for Paul's use of contemporary Rabbinic methods of exegesis.
10. Cf. Charles, Eschatology, Hebrew, Jewish and Christian, 1913.
11. Schürer, Hist. of the Jewish People, div. II. vol. II, sec. 29; Westcott, Intro. to the Study of the Four Gospels, chap. II.; E. F. Scott, The Kingdom and the Messiah, '11.
12. Cf. Jas. Crichton, art. Messiah, Int. St. Bib. Enc.—esp. in Enoch 37-71 is pre-existence hinted.
13. Cf. Weber, Die Genesis d. Paulinischen Theologie, N. Kirchl. Zeit. '10, 4, s. 183 ff., who apparently stresses too far the development of Pauline Christology from the later Jewish messianic hope. Cf. also Kühl, Das Verhältnis d. Apos. Paulus Zum Judenthum, 13, s. 359. f. Cf. Charles, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, '13, No. III, on the Jewish Apocalypses; cf. our ch. II on The Development of the Messianic Idea, etc.
14. The Fundamentals of Christianity. A Study of the Teaching of Jesus and Paul; pp. 155 f.
15. Christus, 1909. 16. I Cor. 8:6, Col. 1:16.
17. Christ the Creative Ideal. Studies in Colossians and Ephesians.
18. So Siegfried, Philo von Alexandria, s. 313 ff.; Beyschlag, ib. above; Weiss, ib.; Stevens, ib. p. 56 f.; Sheldon, ib. p. 31 f.; cf. also Abbott, Col. in ICC.; Peake, Col. in EGT.
19. Cf. I Cor. 1:30, etc. 20. Jesus and Paul, pp. 129-134; cf. Grafe, Die Paulinische Lehre vom Gesetz, 1884; Pfleiderer, Das Urchristentum, 2 te. Aufl. '02, s. 153-178, for emphasis on Paul's dependence on the Wis. of Sol.
21. Poimandres, '04; Die Hellenistischen Mysterien-religionen, '20. 22. Paulus, '04; Paul, '07.
23. Taufe u. Abendmahl bei Paulus, 1903.

24. Kyrios Christos, 1813; 1921, p. 79 f. Jesus der Herr, 1916.
25. In his second op. cit. above. 26. ib.
27. ib. s. 29 f., 48 f.
28. Das Urchristentum, '14. s. 147—as in Gal. 2:20.
29. Jesus der Herr, s. 80 ff.; Kyrios Christos, Kap. I-IV.
30. Cf. Deissmann, Light from Ancient East, p. 161, for corroboration of this fact.
31. Acts 11:26 f.
32. Der Weltheiland, '09, s. 1-25.
33. Rev. of Pfleiderer, Religion u. Religionen, Th. Lit. Zeit, '07, nr. 11, 138. 34. Hellenism and Christianity, '13.
35. The Religious Experience of Saint Paul, '11, chap. IX.
36. The Religion and Theology of Paul, '17, pp. 41-51.
37. Earlier Epistles of St. Paul, p. 233. 38. Quoted by Robertson, art. Paul, Int. St. Bib. Enc.
39. The Evolution of Early Christianity, '14.
40. The Next Step in Religion, '18, pp. 67 ff.
41. Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources, 1912, p. 336; also Der Einfluss d. Mysterien auf. d. Urchristentum, tr. The Influ. of the Mys. Rels. '15, p. 81; Paulus, '04, s. 14, f. 71 f.
42. Die Entstehung d. Paulinischen Christologie, '03, s. 32 f., 39 f., 97 f.
43. Der sterbende u. auferstehende Gottheiland in d. Orientalischen Religionen und ihr Verhältnis zum Christentum, '08, s. 48 ff.
44. Les Religions Orientales, 2d. ed. '03, chap. X.; The Mysteries of Mithra, '10.
45. Essai sur la Christologie de Saint Paul, '06, pp. 17-44.
46. Hermes-Mystik u. d. N. T., '18, s. 16, 103, 167 f.
47. Theol. Tizdschrift, '18, 200 ff. 48. Die Terminologie d. Wiedergeburt, s. 140; Mission d. Christentums, II. 271.
49. St. Paul as a Theologian, tr. '08; Th. d. N. T. s. 48 f.
50. Bib. Th. N. T., '11, 11. 51. Addresses at International Congress of the History of Religions, '12, on Gottesgemeinschaft.
52. Religion u. Religionen, '06; The Early Christian Conception of Christ, '05.
53. The Early Christian Conception, etc. p. 156.
54. Das Antike Mysterien Wesen, s. 235. 55. Das Antike Mysterien Wesen, s. 60. 56. L'Apotre Paul et Jesus Christ, '04, p. 276, 365. 57. Das ewige Leben, '14, s. 78 ff.
58. Zeitschrift für Theol. u. Kirche, '15, s. 44. 59. I Cor. 1:21 f. 60. Religionsgeschichtliche Parallelen, etc. '21, s. 14, 17.
61. Pauline and Other Studies, '06; Expos. Times, X. 1-5.
62. The Originality of the Christian Message, pp. 8, 46, 89 f.
63. Paul and Paulinism, pp. 66 ff. 64. Studies of Paul and His Gospel, pp. 15 ff.
65. The New Testament in the Twentieth Century, '14.
66. St. Paul and the Mystery Religions, '13. 67. The Mys-

tery Religions and Christianity; Norton Lectures, 1920-21, So. Bap. Th. Sem. 68. Mithraism and Christianity, '21, pp. 1-102.
69. St. Paul and Christianity, '13, chap. I. 70. The Mystery Religions and the New Testament, 1920.
71. The Origin of Paul's Religion, '22, chaps. VII and VIII.
72. Art. Paul the Apostle, Int. St. Bib. Enc.
73. Robertson, ib. 2275; cf. also Bacon, Jesus and Paul, pp. 68-77, for the position that only "terms" are borrowed.
74. ib. s. 48 f. 75. Paulus u. Jesus, '07, s. 56.
76. Christus, '09; Urc., '14, Kap. 13 and 14. 77. The Problem of Christianity, '13, vol. I.
78. Our Lord. Belief in the Deity of Christ, '08.
79. N. T. Th. II. 12-20. 80. Der Paulinismus u. d. Logia Jesu, '04, s. 35-154 (but cf. Jülicher, Th. Lit. Zeit. '06, nr. 2, 43, who is "not convinced" by R. 81. As Bousset, Wrede, Lietzmann, E. W. Meyer, Heitmüller, Gardner, Case, et al. 82. St. Paul, etc., p. 6. Cf. also His Religion of Jesus and Faith of Paul, p. 153.
83. Bib. Th. of N. T., I. 276.
84. ib. 85. ib. 86. ib. s. 48 f.
87. Die Eigenart d. Paul. Frommigkeit, '20.
88. ib. 89. Originality of the Christian Message, ch. IV.
90. The Pauline Theology, p. 73.
91. So Sabatier, ib.; cf. also Garvie, Did Paul Evolve His Gospel, Expos. '11, 2, pp. 180-192.
92. N. T. Th. p. 196 f. 93. Rom. 7:15 ff. 94. Phil. 3:6
95. Cf. Acts chs. 3, 4, and 7, especially the noble bearing of Stephen in his martyrdom witnessed by Paul (7:58). Cf. Findlay, art. Paul, HDB; Robertson, art. Paul, Int. St. Bib. Enc.
96. Acts 9:5 ff.; 2 Cor. 4:6; Phil. 3:8.
97. Acts 9:20, 22; Rom. 1:4; cf. Wendt, Apostelgeschichte, Rackham, The Acts of the Apostles, ad loc.; Sanday, ICC, ad loc.
98. Rom. 1:1, etc. 99. Gal. 2:20. 100. Cf. Lightfoot, Galatians, Burton, Gal. in ICC, ad loc.
101. Cf. ch. VII.
102. Cf. Beyschlag, II. 63 ff.; Weiss II. 97 ff.; Stevens, Paul. Th. pp. 200 f.; Sheldon, N. T. Th. 219 ff.
103. Cf. ch. I. for bibliography, except for Schmiedel, Jesus in Modern Criticism, '07, p. 14, who thinks that Paul tells us "deplorably little about Jesus."
104. ib. above. 105. ib. 106. ib. 107. ib. 108. ib. 109. ib.
110. For emphasis on the historical Jesus in Paul, cf. Hausrath, Der Apostel Paulus, s. 142 f.; Beyschlag, Paulus u. die evangelische Geschichte, '12.
111. Gal. 4:4. 112. Gal. 3:16. 113. Rom. 1:3.
114. Rom. 8:3.
115. 2 Cor. 5:21. 116. Rom. 15:3. 117. Ac. 20:30; I Cor.

7:10, 11, 11:23, etc., (cf. Findlay, I Cor. EGT, for view that "Lord" here refs. to the earthly Jesus).
118. I Cor. 11:23. 119. I Cor. 11:23-26. 120. I Cor. 15:1-8.
121. Phil. 2:9, 11 (cf. also Eph. 2:6). 122. Gal. 1:18.
123. Cf. Ac. 11:25, 26, 30, 15:2 f., Gal. 2:1 ff. 124. Cf. Ac. 11:19 f., "those scattered over the persecution of Stephen" could have carried the traditions far and wide.
125. Cf. Ac. 16:10 ff. for the "We" passages, one of Luke's efforts at gathering historical data.
126. Cf. Resch, Paulinismus, as above for parallels of Pauline statements with sayings of Jesus.
127. Belief in Christ, '23, p. 160.
128. Ac. 9:20. 129. I Th. 1:10. 130. 1:4, 9, 5:10, 8:3, 29, 32.
131. I Cor. 1:9, 15:28, 2 Cor. 1:19. 132. Col. 1.13, Eph. 4:13.
133. So Wendt, Apostelgeschichte, 8 Aufl. on 9:20, 22; E. F. Scott, The Fourth Gospel, p. 193, and a host of liberals. The facts point to the official sense as Paul's first thought in his Damascus preaching.
134. So Harnack, Das Wesen Christentum, s. 70 f., 79 f., Bousset, Jesus, '01; Lake, Landmarks of Early Christianity, Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus, '10.
135. So R. Schmidt, Die Paulinische Christologie, s. 123; Biedermann, Dogmatik, s. 36; Beyschlag, II. 76-83; Pfleiderer, Paulinismus, s. 130 (tr. p. 129).
136. So Weiss, I. 400 f.; cf. also Burton, Gal. in ICC, who approaches this view.
137. Augustine based the "metaphysical" Sonship on Col. 1:13 ff.; cf. Ménégoz, Stevens, Schlatter, Adeney (in their N. T. Ths.); also Morgan, ib.; Mackintosh, ib.; Garvie, ib.; Meyer, Godet, Lightfoot, Sanday, comms.
138. Greek, πρωτότοκος, esp. in Col. 1:15, but also in Rom. 8:27 (cf. Lk. 2:7 for phys. sense). 139. Th. d. N. T. 1877.
140. Comms. on Col. 1:15. 141. Grk. Eng. Lex. of N. T.
142. A Manual Greek Lex. of N. T. 143. Paul. Th. p. 214 f.
144. N. T. Th. p. 220 f. 145. Comms. on Col. 1.15.
146. ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ Phil. 2:6. 147. Com. on Phil., which cf. for discussion of the classical and philosophical usages of μορφή; cf. Schumacher, Christus nach seiner Prae-existence u. Kenose.
148. Christus der Herr, Phil. 2:5-11, "not the example of Jesus emph. for Christian devotion to service" but "two distinct forms of existence."
149. Phil. in ICC. 150. I Cor. 4:4, Col. 1:15.
151. I Cor. 11:7. 152. I Cor. 15:49, 2 Cor. 3:18.
153. Cf. Weiss, I. 400; cf. S. N. Rostron, The Christology of St. Paul, '12, p. 114, who thinks that "He emptied Himself" means He "poured out His divine attributes for service to others."
154. ib. I. sec. 78c. 155. ib. p. 209. 156. ib. 157. The Fundamental Christian Faith, '13, who traces the Apostolic and Nicene creeds back to Paul and John.
158. What is the Truth about Jesus Christ? '13. 159. N. T.

Th. p. 22. 160. Cf. Robertson, Gram., pp. 583, 598, for the distinction between ἐκ and διά.
161. Cf. also ICC; Bernard, EGT.; Baur, Theol. and Grotius, Comm. think it refers to "the ethical creation of the church."
162. Com. on Col.
163. So Weiss, II. sec. 103; Stevens, ib. p. 214; Abbott, ICC, et al. Cf. Bleek, Credner, et al, who follow Augustine in regarding "bodily" as equal to "really." Haupt, Komm., Peake, EGT, interpret "a complete and organic whole."
164. Liddell and Scott, Thayer, Cremer, Preuschen, Schmidt, Trench, Abbott-Smith.
165. Lightfoot, Meyer, Abbott, Peake. 166. Beyschlag, II. 167. Θεότης.
76, Weiss, II. 102; Stevens, ib. p. 218; Sheldon, ib. p. 222.
168. Erasmus, Tischendorf, Lachmann, and Nestle (in their Greek texts). 169. So Westcott and Hort (the latter personally in doubt) Scrivner, Weymouth, et al.
170. Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen, Chrysostom, Augustine, Jerome, Theodore, et al.
171. Luther, Calvin, et al. 172. Weiss, I. 393 (not to His "essence" of being, but "position of power and dignity"); Stevens, ib. p. 202; Sheldon, ib. p. 221.
173. As Beza, Tholuck, Usteri, Olshausen, Philippi, Hofmann, Delitzsch, Schulz (only to Christ, in exalted state); Vaughan, Gifford, Godet, Moule, Sanday (with reserve).
174. Cf. Meyer, Rom., Denney, EGT, and esp. Ezra Abbot, Critical Essays; and art. in Jo. of Soc. of Bib. Lit. 1881, for strong presentations of these arguments against referring it to Christ.
175. I Cor. 8:6, Col. 1:16, 2:9; cf. also Tit. 2:13. 176. So urges Stevens, p. 201 f. 177. Cf. Sanday, Rom. ICC; Robertson, Gram. pp. 795, 1108. 178. Col. 1:16, 17.
179. Phil. 2:11 (cf. Eph. 1:20, 21, 24.)
180. Cf. Shenkel, Theologie, p. 289, representing a small group of moderns who deny any sort of pre-existence to Paul's Christ.
181. ib. II. 76 f. 182. N. T. Th. p. 191. 183. Dogmatik, s. 236.
184. Die Christus Vision d. Paulus, u. d. Genesis d. Paul. Ev. 1861, s. 71 ff. 185. Theologie, s. 189. 186. Paulinismus, s. 133 (tr. I. 133). 187. Based on his expression, I Cor. 15:45 f. "the last Adam," etc.; cf. Buttenwieser, art. Messiah, J. E. vol. VIII, 510 f., and Wicher, Bib. World, Nov. '09, pp. 317 ff, for a pre-existent Messiah in Jewish Theol. Some of these scholars think Paul taught the pre-existence of Christ but they do not accept it, as Biedermann, s. 236, and Pfleiderer s. 130, tr. 129.
188. Gal. 4:4; cf. Rom. 8:3. 189. 2 Cor. 8:9. 190. Phil. 2:6; cf. Lightfoot on it; also Vincent, Kennedy; Jülicher, art. in N. T. Wissenschaft, '16. I, s. 18-26; Kögel as above. 191. Col. 1:15.
192. Col. 1:17. 193. Col. 1:16; cf. Schleiermacher, Stud. u. Krit. and Baur, N. T. Th., for view that Col. 1:16 refers to the "creation of the church."

194. Lightfoot tr. Phil. 2:6b, "being equal with God."
195. As Meyer, Lightfoot, Vincent, Kennedy, Abbott, Peake, Sanday (Rom. 1:4 and Christologies Ancient and Modern, p. 77 f. et al.
196. Weiss, Schlatter (II. 287 ff.) Weidner, Adeney, Sheldon; also Liddon, Bamp. Lects. 1866; Gifford, The Incarnation: A Study of Phil. 2:5-11; Bruce, Humiliation of Christ, Lect. I.; St. Paul's Conception of Christianity, p. 300; Weizsäcker, Apos. Zeitalt, s. 221, who speaks of "a personal existence before His human birth" (interpreting Paul). For the view that Paul was familiar with the story of the virgin birth and accepted it, see Bishop R. J. Cooke, Did Paul Know of the Virgin Birth? 1926.
197. Pauline and Other Studies, '06; so Garvie, Studies of Paul and His Gospel '11; so Mackintosh, The Doctrine of the Person of Christ, '12.
198. Gal. 4:4; cf. 3:13. 199. Cf. Rom. 3:25 f.; 5:10; 2 Cor. 5:18 f. Cf. E. A. Gordon, Asian Christology and Mahayana, etc. '21, who claims to find the doctrine of "reconciliation by sacrificial death" in "the Amida Doctrines" of Buddhism.
200. Cf. Abbott, ICC; Peake, EGT; cf. Carré, Paul's Doctrine of Redemption, '14, who holds that the Apostle's emphasis is on the "eschatological and cosmic redemption."
201. Gal. 5:11; 6:12, 14; I Cor. 1:17, 18; Phil. 2:8; 3:18; Col. 1:20; 2:14.
202. Ac. 5:30; 10:39. 203. See art. Cross in HDB, in Int. St. Bib. Enc.; also Plummer, ICC, I Cor. 1:18; Findlay, EGT, ib. Cf. J. H. Moulton, The Gospel According to Paul, Expos. '11, July, pp. 16-28; Mabie, "The Meaning and Message of the Cross," chs. IV and V. 204. I Cor. 1:18 f. 205. I Cor. 1:23, 24; for the meaning of Paul's doctrine of reconciliation, cf. Denney, The Doctrine of Reconciliation; for a more liberal view, cf. Bacon, Jesus and Paul, Lect. II. Cf. art. Reconciliation, HDB, Int. St. Bib. Enc. For the "rational consistency" of Paul's Gospel with "modern philosophical views," cf. Ramsay, The Teaching of Paul in Terms of Today, pp. 285, 303, Cf. Inge, ib., who says, "The incarnation and the cross are central doctrines."
206. I Cor. 2:8.
207. Gal. 1:3, 19; 4:6, 5; 10; 6:14, 18; 2 Cor. 1:2, 3, 14; 2:12, etc. 208. 1:2, 14; 2:11, 19, 24, 29, 30, etc.
209. 1:3, 10; 2:6; 3:13, 16, 17, etc. 210. Gal. 3:10, Rom. 1:1; Phil. 1:1. 211. I Cor. 7:22; Phil. 1:1; Col. 4:12; 2 Cor. 4:5.
212. I Cor. 6:19, 20. 213. Rom. 10:2; cf. Sanday.
214. Phil. 2:10. 215. Greek, ἐχαρίσατο. 216. Phil. 2:9, 11; cf. Geo. a Barton, art. Some Influences of Apollos in the New Testament, Jo. Bib. Lit., XLIII, Pts. I and II. 219 f., who thinks Paul clearly stated the "deity" of Jesus in Ph. 2:6 ff., and that it "was given back to Him, because of His choice as a man, at the Resurrection," (but he holds that Paul did not yield to the influence of Apollos and accept the virgin birth of Jesus.)
217. Art. God Our Father and the Lord of Glory, Lord Jesus Christ, Princeton Th. Rev. 7, 17, 191ff. 218. 307 f.

219. Belief in Christ, p. 100 f. 220. Cf. Sanday, ICC, Denney, EGT.
221. EGT. 222. Com. on 2 Cor. 4:11. 223. Col. 1:18-20; hinted in Rom. 12:5ff; I Cor. 12:12ff.
224. Col. 1:15-17. 225. 1:14. 226. Cf. Findlay, EGT, I Cor. 11:3f.
227. I Cor. 15: 14-20; cf. C. C. Hall, Universal Elements in the Christian Religion, p. 170ff.
228. Phil. 2:9. 229. Gal. 4:4; Rom. 8:3; Phil. 2:8.
230. Cf. numbers of times διά with Gen. occurs. 231. 2 Cor. 5:21. 232. Aorist, ἔγνω ; cf. Roberston, Gram. p. 830f.
233. Rom. 15:3. 234. Gal. 2:20; 2 Cor. 5:14-18. 235. 2 Cor. 5:21; cf. Forsyth who writes in Rev. and Expos. '18, 3 on The Christianity of Christ and Christ Our Christianity.
236. Phil. 2:6; cf. Schmidt, Syn., who contends μορφή signifies "external likeness." Cf. Trench, Syn., Thayer, Abott-Smith, who contend for an "inner" likeness as its meaning.
237. 1:1, 18. 238. So Lightfoot translates it.
239. Cf. Vincent, Kennedy.
240. I Cor. 15:24, 25.
241. Phil. 3:10.
242. Greek, γινώσκω ; cf. Abbott and Kennedy.

CHAPTER X

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

Paul, the "master-mind of the first century," was the pioneer in the making of Christologies. But as soon as his Christology had received its finishing touches in the prison at Rome, another maker of Christology, the equal of Paul in intellectuality and learning,[1] the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, appears, whose Christology, couched in brilliant literary form, is similar to that of Paul, but emphasizes some old features to a different degree and adds new ones. The Christology of Hebrews is an advance upon that of Paul.

1 *The Literary Problems.* Whoever the author may be, Paul-Luke, the former of the thoughts, the latter of the composition, as claimed by Clement of Alexandria,[2] and held by some modern scholars;[3] or Barnabas, as held by many moderns;[4] or Priscilla (in collaboration with Aquilla)[5]; or the brilliant and learned Apollos (the most probable guess and perhaps the most popular view with modern scholars),[6] the portrait of Christ, so brilliantly and so perfectly painted, is the centre of our interest and study.

The problem as to who were the readers addressed, whether Jewish Christians of Jerusalem[7]; or of Alexandria[8]; or of Syria (Antioch)[9] or Jewish Christians in general[10]; or Gentile Christians (almost exclusively)[11]; or a "mixed" group of Jewish and Gentile Christians in Rome (most probable)[12] does not affect our interpretation of the portrait of Jesus here painted.

But the purpose of the author plays a vital part in the proper interpretation of his Christ-portrait. His aim is not to deter the readers from apostasy to Judaism,[13] but to show that Christianity is the final and absolute religion; that Jesus, the eternal Son, who is at the same time a real suffering man, *is* Christianity; that by the sacrifice of Himself He makes an efficacious and universal "purification" of sins,[14] thus obtaining

an "eternal redemption,[15] that therefore Christianity is "better" than Judaism, and, by inference, the final and absolute religion;[16] that for this reason they should shake off their present lethargy and go on to perfection; yea, because Jesus was made perfect by suffering, they should follow His example and patiently suffer, "enduring the cross and despising the shame," thus teaching the world the highest culture or "gnosis" (Scott).[17]

2 *The Historical Sources.* The mystery religions exerted little influence on this author.[18] According to Weiss,[19] Stevens,[20] Dods,[21] and Bruce,[22] Paul had no considerable influence on him. On the other hand, without sufficient grounds, Ménégoz,[23] W. Robertson Smith,[24] Pfleiderer,[25] Holtzmann,[26] von Soden,[27] Sheldon,[28] and Nikel,[29] magnify Paulinism as a source. The facts suggest that the "heavenly Christ" of Paul gave the author only a starting point for the construction of a Christology all his own with a new pattern and new imagery of expression.[30] Both consider Christianity a spiritual and universal religion; both think of Jesus the eternal Son, the suffering man, as the heart of Christianity,[31] and of His death as the means of redemption.[32]

But the author paints the "historical Jesus," as Paul does not, and for this he must have used the early Christian tradition. He refers to the Gospel of the "so great salvation" as "being confirmed unto us by those who heard," through the Divine witness in wonder-works and spiritual gifts.[33] That is, he is in direct connection with the early church testimony of the Jesus of history. Prominent throughout the Epistle is the conception of Jesus as the Messiah and the kingdom-builder,[34] which shows the author's indebtedness to early tradition.[35]

The author is thoroughly acquainted with the Old Testament: the careers of Abraham and Melchizedek, Moses and Joshua, the judges and the prophets, its modes and fragments of revelation, and its sacrificial system.[36] Holtzmann[37] and Weiss[38] emphasize this source, but not Beyschlag,[39] Stevens,[40] Sheldon,[41] MacNeille,[42] Scott,[43] Gore.[44] The facts suggest that he used the Septuagint (O. T.) as the starting point for his theme, the priesthood of Christ, but it was not *the*, or even *a* chief shaping force of his Christology. It furnished him the historical *suggestions* in the career of Melchizedek, and the hint of a new covenant to supplant the old.[45]

Only a few scholars minimize the influence of Alexandrianism on Hebrews—Riehm,[46] Pfleiderer,[47] Weiss,[48] Bruce,[49] Schlatter.[50] On the other hand, Holtzmann, Beyschlag, Feine, Weinel, Stevens, Sheldon,[51] Scott,[52] and Gore,[53] emphasize Alexandrianism as a chief shaping force. The author even adopts the Alexandrian idea (borrowed by Philo from Plato)[54] that visible earthly things are only "shadows" or "copies" of the real things which are in heaven.[55] With this Alexandrian idea he develops his climacteric argument for the superiority of the priesthood of Christ over the Levitical. The priesthood of Christ has its sanctuary "in the heavens," the very presence of God, whereas the Levitical priesthood officiates in a "tent" which is only a "copy" of the real sanctuary, a "shadow" of the real presence.[56]

On the other hand, the author's religious experience is, par excellence, the peculiar shaping force of his Christology. He has not only received the tradition that Jesus was "a man," but he has felt the touch ("succor") of the sympathizing human Jesus; he has not only taken over from Paul the idea of His Sonship but he has seen for himself "the effulgence" of His Divine person; he has not only accepted the suggestion from the Old Testament that He is the Melchizedek Priest, but he has found "the new way" to God, opened up by the Son's sacrifice of "Himself." With Bishop Gore[57] we may express it: "By the side of St. Paul, the writer to the Hebrews stands with a very substantial originality, and with a very independent grasp upon the facts concerning Jesus; but by the side of Philo, he stands on a different basis, and is traveling by a different road to a different goal." His originality is as marked and brilliant as Paul's. His intellectuality and his religious experience give color to every line of his Christ-portrait.

3 *The Eternal Son.* Jesus is called "Son"[58] in the opening sentence, and to Him are ascribed cosmic relations and functions: He is mediating[59] Creator of the ages[60]; He bears up all things by the word of His power[61]; He is the heir of all things.[62] He is also described in terms which imply His intimate relation with God: "Who being the effulgence of His glory and the impress of His nature (or substance)."[63] What does the author mean by asserting that cosmic relations and functions belong to Jesus as "Son"; that He enjoys such an intimate relation with God?

(1) *He is the Unique Son of God.* In this sentence it is not the designation but the characterization of the "Son" which is uppermost in the author's mind. The absence of the article with the word "Son"[64] is a delicate stroke of the Greek pen to call attention not to a particular Son of God but to one who has the character of Son. In the nature of the medium of Divine revelation—a "Son" medium—the author sees the proof of the superiority of the Christian revelation. Jesus as "Son" is greater than prophets or angels as a medium of the message of God to men. Weiss[65] correctly says, this phrase ("in a Son") emphasizes "the *nature* of a peerless person." On the other hand, in four passages the author uses the article and thus emphasizes the identification of the historical Jesus with the Son of God.[66] The eternal Son is the earthly Jesus in one personality.[67]

(2) *The Son is Addressed as "God."* "But He says to the Son, 'Thy throne, O God, is forever,' " etc.[68] In the Old Testament passage (Ps. 45 (44) 6f) the term "God" is applied to Jehovah, but in Hebrews to Jesus. *Weiss*[69] thinks the author "goes beyond Rom. 9:5, as He (Jesus) is also praised by a doxology."[70] Westcott in 1:8 writes[71]: "The quotation establishes the conclusion which the writer wishes to draw as to the essential difference between the Son and angels." Jesus is to be worshipped as God; the angels are only worshippers. But we must notice that in the next verse he asserts of the Son a subordination of office: "God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows."[72] Whatever relation to the Father Jesus may sustain, in His personal nature, for the task of His mediatorical kingdom He receives a special "anointing" from God as His God.[73]

(3) *The Son is Eternal.* As the "effulgence" of God, as "Son," as "heir of all things," as "God," He must have been conceived by the author as existing in eternity; that is, before He became the human Jesus. But in what sense is pre-existence predicated of the Son? That some sort of pre-existence is ascribed to the Son no expert expositor now dares to deny. One group of scholars represented by Ménégoz,[74] Beyschlag,[75] and more recently by E. F. Scott,[76] deny to the author the assertion of personal pre-existence, but claim that he meant to say, He existed "as an eternal idea" in the mind of God. Scott, although he admits that the high priesthood of Jesus is

grounded in "His relation to God," "in His nature,"[77] denies that the author ever "affirms, in so many words, that Jesus was Himself of divine nature."[78] On the basis of the author's use of Alexandrian ideas and of his putting religious and even theological content into Alexandrian terms, Scott denies that the author is thinking of a "metaphysical" Sonship.[79]

Beyschlag[80] based his view of an "ideal" pre-existence on the fact that Wisdom in the Book of Wisdom[81] is personified and described with the terms of Hebrews 1:3; on the further fact that Philo ascribes to his non-personal logos cosmic relations and functions just as the author of Hebrews does to Jesus. On the other hand, conservative and moderately liberal scholars hold that the author thinks of the Son as existing in person before He entered upon His human career of suffering.[82]

(4) *Jesus "the First-born"* (Prototokos). This term is applied to Jesus in the midst of a discussion whose previous context has ascribed to Him cosmic relations and functions[83] and whose subsequent context presents Him as the object of worship by the angels, in which He is called "God" and the "Lord" who is "the same" and "abides forever."[84] To Jews primo-genital sonship meant heirship of all things. The heir is the first-born son. So it is, according to Hebrews, in God's family.

But in what sense is Jesus conceived to be "the first-born" of all God's sons? Beyschlag[85] thinks he means that Jesus is the first-born of all His human sons. Riehm[86] and Westcott[87] think the author means He is the first-born of the whole creation.[88]. But Weiss,[89] in stricter accord with the context, thinks Jesus is conceived as the first-born when compared with the angels.[90] Jesus is therefore superior to the angels, not only because He is the "Son," but also because He is the "first-born" Son, which means not only that He became God's Son before the angels did, but that He is the "first" in dignity and privilege;[91] He is "the heir of all things"; He is the "Lord" of the new theocracy; He is in some sense "God"; yea, by virtue of His primo-genital Sonship He is to be "worshipped" by the angels themselves.

(5) *The Nature of His Sonship.* In what sense, in the Christology of Hebrews, is He Son?[92] Without doubt the title includes, as claimed by Scott as a primal meaning,[93] His official Sonship, that is, His messiahship. By all means it includes

the *ethical Sonship,* His likeness to God in sinlessness and perfection of character.[94] But is that all the author means when He calls Him the "effulgence" of God's glory, "the first-born," "the heir of all things," "the Lord," yea "God" to be "worshipped" by the angels? Is he merely the One Son who enjoys an unique sonship but only in the sense that He, "above all His fellows," has attained unto moral perfection? Many modern liberals are inclined to limit this christological term in Hebrews to this ethical sense.[95] He is not Son, they say, in "essence" or being. He is not the Son in "a metaphysical" sense, nor God in the essence of His being or nature. On the other hand, conservative expositors, and even some moderate liberals, think the author of Hebrews predicates of Jesus a "metaphysical" or superhuman sonship which involves "essential" Deity. That is, His personality is essentially Divine. He was a living, active Divine personality before He became the human Jesus of history. To quote Westcott:[96] "The title Son expresses not a moral relation, but a relation of being." Weiss[97] also pointedly expresses it: "He (author) here takes a metaphysical turn," for the term "Son" is "the designation of the nature of an eternal, divine person." Stevens,[98] although refusing to discuss the minute theological bearing of the terms in 1:3, asserts: "They express the unique and incomparable relation of the preexistent Son of God." Dods[99] emphatically says: "There is nothing in the Father which is not reproduced in the Son, save the relation of Father to Son," Chas. Gore[100] very recently writes: "His personality is divine throughout. He is the eternal Son."[101] Even Baur[102] and Pfleiderer,[103] although not personally accepting the doctrine of the eternal Sonship of Christ, concede that the author of Hebrews ascribed to Him Divine attributes and intended them to be understood as predicating a Divine nature.

By what line of argument may the objections of extreme liberals to the eternal Sonship in Hebrews be answered?

(a) The objection urged by Beyschlag and Scott that the author is influenced by Alexandrianism must be squarely met. It must be admitted that the author is thoroughly imbued with the spirit of Alexandrianism; that he uses Alexandrian terms; that the "logos" idea likely underlies his whole Christology. But, whereas Philo merely personifies his logos when he ascribes to it Divine relations and cosmic functions, our author

unmistakably identifies the eternal Son with the historical Jesus.[104] He uses the historical title Jesus to the end of his treatise; he alludes to historical facts, especially His death on the cross and His optimistic patience in meeting it.[105] As Bishop Gore well says:[106] "By the side of Philo, he (our author) stands on a different basis, and is travelling to a different goal." Philo stands on a philosophical basis and is travelling to the goal of reconciliation between Hebrew revelation and Greek philosophy. The author of Hebrews is standing on the historical, experimental basis and is moving to the goal of proving that Christianity, because its Founder Jesus as the eternal Son of God sacrificed Himself to open up the new spiritual way to God, is superior to Judaism, and therefore is the final, absolute religion.

(b) But may it not be objected that the author resorts to a fictitious representation rather than to historical facts to prove the ceaseless life of Melchizedek, which is a historical illustration of the "indissoluble life"[107] of Jesus? Yes, he appeals to the silence of the records, a method of speaking and reasoning common to the orientals,[108] as to his birth, pedigree, and death. But he does not seek to prove the eternal Sonship and "indissoluble life" of the Son by this fictitious representation. It is only an illustration from the silence of the records which he allegorizes to show some sort of parallel between Melchizadek and Jesus. In reality He proves the unchangeable priesthood of Jesus, which implies His eternal Sonship, by appealing to Ps. 110:3, "Thou are a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek."[109] Davidson sums it up thus:[110] "Such a comparison is decisive against attributing these characteristics to Melchizedek in a real sense. They belong to the portrait of him, which was so drawn that he was 'made like' the Son of God—a figure corresponding to the Son of God and suited to suggest Him." That is, the perpetuity of the priesthood of Christ is not proved but only "suggested" by the allusion to the silence of records concerning Melchizedek's birth, pedigree, and death. We know our author is allegorizing in 7:1-10, but in 7:14 he appeals to history when he asserts "our Lord sprang from Judah," and in 12:2 when he alludes to Christ's death on the cross. Is there any hint that he is allegorizing in chapter I in ascribing to the Son Divine relations and cosmic functions?

(c) Moreover, it may be answered by urging the patent fact

that our author constructs his Christology upon the pillars of history. His cosmic Christ is the historical Jesus whose portrait he has seen and accepted from "those who heard."[111] He is not idealizing when he paints a portrait of the eternal Son. He is drawing the outlines of the Jesus of history who is, because He ever has been, the eternal Son. He has reached this conclusion by weighing in the balances of his Christian experience the evidence from early Christian tradition that He is the Christ and "the Son who knows the Father." So the Christ of Hebrews is no product of theological fancy, but the historical Jesus. To quote Gore again:[112] "He believed in the man Jesus; he clung with intense conviction and appreciation to His human sufferings of body and mind—It is this strongly held historical basis of his faith which so deeply differentiates it from the ideology of Philo. It is not that he has transmuted the faith of the first disciples into something different by the use of Alexandrian ideas. It is that the first faith in Jesus, the actual historical person, accepted as what He declared Himself to be, the Son of God, has found in the Alexandrian tradition of Judaism ideas and terms in which it can express itself." Therefore we conclude: Since the author is so careful in positing the human Jesus as the basis of his Christology, it is not thinkable that he would give himself up to a wild idealization when he comes to paint the cosmic and Divine features of his Christ-portrait.

"From those who heard" he must have known that Jesus claimed to be "the Son" who knows "the Father" and who has had "all things delivered" unto Him by the Father.[113] Hence his portrait of Jesus as the eternal Son must be accepted as reality and not as "idealizing." The eternal Sonship of Jesus is a parallel fact to that of the historical Jesus.

4 *The Human Jesus.* Sheldon is correct in saying,[114] "In describing the transcendence and glory of the pre-incarnate Son the Epistle to the Hebrews vies with the later Epistles of Paul and reaches essentially to the level of the prologue of John's Gospel." On the other hand, our author has painted in realistic colors the human Jesus. He has given us the finest discussion of the humanity of Jesus to be found in the New Testament. The Synoptists give us the bare record, and that in fragments, of His career as a man; Paul recognizes His earthly life and teachings, and emphasizes His death as a means of sal-

vation; John tells us that "The Logos became flesh and dwelt among us" but usually hides His human features with brilliant touches of His Divine glory.[115] But the author of Hebrews has hung in the gallery of New Testament Christology the finest portrait of the really human Jesus.[116] Out of thirteen references to the historical Christ nine times he designates Him by His simple earthly title, Jesus.[117] Paul, in all his thirteen epistles, only fifteen times uses the simple title Jesus. Although the author of Hebrews vies with Paul in painting the Son of God with terms equally as strong as Paul's, at the same time he paints Him as the most real man that ever lived and suffered. Although not referring to His birth, he knows that He "sprang from Judah"[118]; that He had flesh and blood like His human brothers[119]; that He was the Representative Man fulfilling the promise of world dominion in Ps. 8:5 f[120]; that He was tempted to do wrong as any man might be[121]; He was a man with strong emotions, shedding tears of anguish and uttering mighty cries of need[122]; a man of faith and prayer, of patience and devotion to God, of humility and fidelity to principle[123]; a model man worthy of being followed by others in His faith and hope and joy[124]; a man who learned to practice obedience through the patience taught Him by the things He suffered[125]; a man who attained the highest moral perfection (in sympathy and compassion) through the things He suffered[126]; because He suffered by being tempted to sin, He became a sympathizing friend and a merciful High Priest to all the tempted and suffering[127]; yea, because He was a man who suffered, He became the author and finisher of man's faith and the cause of eternal salvation.[128]

5 *The Son Jesus the Suffering High Priest.* The eternal Son is the Jesus of history. The human Jesus is the Divine Son. To our author the human Jesus—Divine Son is a single personality. His life is "indissoluble."[129] There is no break, by birth or earthly environment or death, in the continuity of His personality. He is "the same yesterday, today, and forever."[130] To quote from Westcott[131]: "The Divine personality was unchanged by the assumption of manhood.—His perfect humanity was in absolute harmony with His Divine nature." Scott,[132] in a beautiful metaphor from music, speaks of His "earthly life as an interlude in a larger heavenly life." The larger heavenly life includes the past and future eternity. The years of His

life on earth were a necessary "interlude"[133] with their minor notes of suffering to "make perfect" the author of salvation; that is, to make the Son a sympathizing friend and a pitying High Priest.[134] His life is one. His personality is one. His earthly life and sufferings are necessary for the execution of His High Priestly function—the opening up for men of the new way to God.

Our author paints four typical scenes of the sufferings endured by Jesus: the temptations[135]; the contradictions and persecutions by His enemies[136]; His agonies in Gethsemane,[137] and His death on the cross.[138] And why did the sinless Jesus, the Representative Man, suffer? Our author replies with three kindred reasons:—

(1) The human Jesus-Divine Son must suffer in order to attain unto the highest type of moral perfection.[139] To our author there are degrees of perfection, and Jesus, to be a successful High Priest must first of all develop, as a personality, the highest type of moral perfection. The function of priesthood is grounded in personality—Divine—human personality. The personality of the High Priest must stand on the highest grade of moral perfection.[140]

But what does this mean? Perhaps we shall never know all the author put into the meaning of the phrase "to make perfect through suffering." Westcott[141] says of the verb: "The conception of teleiosai (make perfect) is the bringing of Christ to full moral perfection of His humanity." So Weiss,[142] Stevens,[143] Bruce,[144] Sheldon,[145] Dods[146] and Scott.[147] On the other hand, Beyschlag,[148] seems to overstate the "moral development" of Jesus, which extends from the lower stages of "true human innocence" to the higher stages of "moral development and perfection." And yet, it is in harmony with modern psychology to think of Jesus as developing moral and spiritual strength through the experiences of victory over temptation. Every temptation resisted means moral strength stored up for future tests.

(2) Especially must the Son become the human Jesus and must suffer, in order to develop the capacity for pity and sympathy. He had to suffer as a brother man to be able to sympathize with His sinning suffering human brothers.[149] This is psychologically sound.

(3) The climactic goal of His sufferings was that He might

become "the author (Aitios) of eternal salvation."[150] He was the suffering High Priest. "Apart from shedding of blood is no remission" (of sins).[151] Although our author thinks of Christ's "sacrifice of Himself" as being actually made in "the holy of holies" of the Father's presence,[152] he thinks of His sufferings and death as indispensable prerequisites to His entering into the heavenly sanctuary.[153] Jesus the Son is the suffering Redeemer before He becomes the officiating High Priest in heaven.[154]

6 *Resumé.* In this portrait of Christ the following features are prominent in the color lines:— (1) The eternal Sonship of Jesus, with Divine relations and cosmic functions, is colored with lines of brilliancy equal to the pre-existent exalted Christ of Paul. The author scarcely transcends, but he evidently equals, Paul in bringing to the forefront of his portrait the eternal Son. (2) The author outdoes Paul, by far, in placing at the centre of his portrait the suffering human Jesus. The Christ of Hebrews, the eternal Son, and the High Priest who offers up Himself "to atone for sins," is veritably the Jesus of history. The Christ of Hebrews is not the product of an idealizing fancy, but He is the eternal Son who became the human historical Jesus, that He might be the suffering High Priest. (3) The Christ of Hebrews is the suffering Redeemer, and as such is the heart of Christianity. Like Paul, but with even more emphasis and much more elaboration of the doctrine, the author of Hebrews describes Christianity as the religion of redemption, and Christ's death as the only efficacious medium of moral and spiritual redemption for mankind.

NOTES TO CHAPTER X

1. Cf. Gore, Belief in Christ, pp. 94 ff.

2. Cf. Eusebius, HE, VI. 2-3. 3. Calvin, Com.; Hug, INT; Ebrard, Delitzsch, Grotius, coms.; W. M. Lewis, Bib. World, 1898; A. R. Eager, Expos.[6] X. 74ff.; Ramsay, Lk. the Physician, 708.

4. Schmidt, Salmon, Weiss, Zahn, INT; Blass, Philology; Gregory, Can. and Text, p. 223; Ayles, Destination, Date, and Authorship of Ep. to Heb. 1899; Bartlet, Expos. '02; Goodspeed, Ep. to Heb. (with reserve) et al.

5. Harnack, Preuschen's Zeitschrift, I. 16-41; Probabilia über d. Addresse, u. d. Verfasser des Heb. brief, ZNTW, I (00);

R. Harris, Sidelights on N. T. Research, '08, pp. 154-174, argument "is much strengthened" by the supposedly "feminized" tone in Ep.; cf. Bleek (below) 421, who suggested Priscilla before Harnack did.

6. So guessed Luther, sermon on I Cor. 3:4; Bleek, ib. 420; Tholuck, Kom; Alford, com.; Hilgenfield, Einl.; Reuss, L' Epitre aux Heb.; Pfleiderer, Urc.; Farrar, CGT; Bruce, HDB; Reese, INT, St., Bib. Enc. (last two with reserve); Scott, Ep. to Heb. '22.

7. So Chrysostom, Bleek, de Wette, Delitzsch, Riehm, Tholuck, Luenemann, B. Weiss, Heb. brief, '10; Nikel, Heb. brief, '14.

8. So Baur, Einl. 385; Hilgenfeld, Einl.; Köstlin, Th. Jahrb'k, 1853, et al.

9. Hofmann, Kom.; Rendall, Com. p. 69f.; cf. Stevens, Th. of N. T. 487. 10. Baumgarten, Heinrichs, Coms.; Schwegler, N. Z. II. 304.

11. So Weizsäcker, ib.; Harnack, Chron.; von Soden, Kom.; McGiffert, ib.; Pfleiderer, ib.; Jülicher, ib. 12. Hilgenfeld Zahn, INT; Wettstein, Com.; Holtzmann, ib.; Kurtz, Heb. brief; Renan, ib.; Goodspeed, ib. 13. Cf. M. Stuart, com. 14. 1:3; 2:17; 9:25, 26. 15. 9:12.

16. The key-word of Heb. is "better," 1:4; 6:9; 8:6, etc.

17. Cf. 2:10; 12:2ff; cf. Scott, ib. 38ff.; also Goodspeed, art. First Clement Called Forth by Hebrews, Jo. Bib. Lit. 30. 157-160, who emph. "the stirring call of Heb. to Chr. teachership and leadership." Cf. MacNeille, Christology of Ep, to Heb. '14, p.13f., who emph. the aim as against "the subtle power of unbelief, indifference, formalism."

18. So Scott, ib. p. 65 f. For much influence, cf. MacNeille, ib. 108 f.

19. INT, II. 7f. 20. Th. of N. T. 488. 21. EGT, Intro.

22. Art. Heb. in HDB. 23. Th. de l'Epître aux Heb. 190.

24. Art. Heb. in En. Bib. (with von Soden). 25. Paulinism, II. 53. 26. ib. II. 286. 27. Hd. Kom., Einl. s. 2, art in En. Bib.

28. ib. 270. 29. Der Heb. brief, '14. 30. So Scott, ib. 49f.

31. Cf. Harnack, What is Christianity? '01; '04, for view that the doctrine of the Father, not the doctrine of the Son, is the essence of Christianity.

32. Cf. Gal. 3:13, 4:4; Rom. 3:24-26; Col. 1:14 ff. with Heb. 7:11-10:18.

33. 2:3-5.

34. Esp. 2:5-18; 3:6, 14; 5:1; 6:1; 9:11, 14, 28. 35. So Weiss, Bib. Th. II. 178; Beyschlag, ib. II. 289; Scott, ib. 54 ff., 60-62.

36. 1:1; 7:1-10, 18; cf. also ch. II. 37. ib. II. 287.

38. Int. II. 8; Bib. Th. II. 172. 39. ib. II. 289.

40. ib. 487. 41. ib. 273 f. 42. ib. p. 105. 43. ib. 54f. 62f. 44. ib. 94 f. 45. 7:1-10; cf. Jer. 31:31f. with 8:8 ff.

46. Heb. brief, 416f. 47. Urc. tr. 631. 48. ib. II. 186, n. 6. 49. HDB; also Ep. to Heb. 50. Th. d. N. T. II. 436.

51. In their N. T. Ths. 52. ib. 54 ff., 60 ff.

53. ib. 94 f. 54. Cf. Timaeus, 28c; Repub. 597; Philo, Mun. Op. 4; de Vita Mos. 146.

55. 8:2 ff. Christ officiates in the real (ἀληθινός), sanctuary in heaven of which the tabernade is a "copy."

56. Cf. 7:1-8:5. 57. Belief in Christ, p. 97.

58. 1:1, υἱός. 59. Grk. δι' οὗ, through whom; cf. Robertson, Gram. p. 580 f., 636 f.

60. 1:2; cf. Dods, EGT, who speaks of "the evolution of God's purposes through the ages."

61. 1:3. 62. 1:2. 63. 1:3.

64. ἐν υἱῷ not ἐν τῷ υἱῷ ; cf. Robertson, ib. 790 ff.

65. Bib. Th. II. 185. 66. 1:14; 5:3; 6:6; 10:29.

67. Cf. Westcott, Com. p. 427; Dods, EGT, ad loc.

68. 1:8. 69. Bib. Th. II. 184.

70. 13:21. 71. Com. p. 26.

72. 1:9; a part of the quotation.

73. Cf. Beyschlag, ib. II. 309, who admits He is called Κύριος (1:10, applied in O. T. to Jehovah), Lord, but overemphasizes the Son's subordination; cf. Weiss, ib. II. 184f, for a just balancing of subordination and exaltation.

74. ib. ch. I. 75. ib. II. 179. 76. ib. ch. VIII.

77. p. 155 f. 78. p. 157. 79. ib. 161, 168f.

80. ib. II. 310f. 81. 7:22 f. 82. So Dorner, Hist. of Devel. of Doc. of Person of Christ, tr. 1861-3; Bengel, Gnomon; Bleek, Lunemann, Delitzsch, Riehm, Westcott, Dods (in their comms.) Weiss, Stevens, Schlatter, Feine, Weinel, Sheldon (in N. T. Ths.); Mackintosh, ib.; Gore, ib. 83. 1:1-4. 84. 1:8-13; cf. Westcott, Dods, ad loc. 85. II. 185. 86. ib. 291. 87. ib. p. 23.

88. The View of Paul in Col. 1:15. 89. ib. II. 185; cf. also Dods, Goodspeed, Scott, MacNeille, ib. p. 70.

90. Cf. Job. 2:1; 38:7; Ps. 29:1, etc., where angels are called "sons of God."

91. Cf. again the fact that His being called "the firstborn," and that the angels are bidden to "worship" Him, occur in the same sentence, 1:6; cf. Weiss, II. 185, Dods, EGT, ad loc., as to the time when He becomes "the first-born";—(1) at the incarnation (Chrys., Calvin, Bengel, Bruce, et al.; (2) at His resurrection (Grotius, et al); (3) at the Parousia (Riehm, Lunemann, Davidson, Weiss, Stevens, Dods, Goodspeed, MacNeille, et al.

92. Cf. ch. IV. for the 8 uses of the term υἱός, in contemporary lit.; cf. MacNeille, 84ff.

93. 3 ib. p. 155 f. 94. 4:15, 7:26, 27, etc.

95. Cf. Beyschlag, II. 309 ff.; Scott, ib, 155 ff. See also Goodspeed, ib. on ch. I.

96. ib. p. 427. 97. II. 186f.

98. ib. p. 502. 99. EGT, IV. 251, whom cf. for the philosophical significance of Greek terms in 1:3.

100. Belief in Christ, (1923) p. 96.

101. Similar view by Riehm, ib. 278, 300, 408, 412; Vincent, Word Studies, IV. 383 (on 1:3); Milligan, Th. of Ep. to Heb.; Estes, Gould, Adeney, Sheldon (in N. T. Ths.); MacNeille, ib. pp. 91 ff.

Mackintosh, ib. ch. IV; Bruce, Humiliation of Christ, 25 ff; 264 ff; DuBose, High Priesthood and Incarnation, '08.

102. N. T. Theologie, 1864. 103. Urc. '02.

104. For emphasis upon the eternal Sonship of Christ, cf. further Selbie, Aspects of Christ, '09; R. M. Wenley, Modern Thought and the Crisis in Belief, '09; Griffith-Thomas, Christianity is Christ, '09; W. D. MacKenzie, The Final Faith, '10; Machen, Christianity and Liberalism, '23, et al.

105. As in 10:19; 12:2, 24; 13:12.

106. ib. p. 97.

107. 7:16. 108. Cf. Delitzsch, ib.; Dods, ib.

109. 7:17; cf. Dods, Goodspeed, Coms.

110. Quoted by Dods, EGT. 111. 2:3.

112. Ib. p. 97; cf. also Scott, ib. p. 49 f. 60-62, who, although denying the personal pre-existence of Christ in Heb., admits Heb. stands "closer to the Apostles than it does to Paul."

113. Cf. Feine, ib. s. 48 f. If Paul knew the claim of Jesus in Mt. 11:27, how much more probable that the author of Heb. did! Cf. 1:2-5.

114. ib. p. 284.

115. Cf. 11:35, where he shows Jesus weeping as a man, but at once he paints Him as the life-giver in raising Lazarus.

116. I refer especially to 2:6-18, but other human touches occur to the end of the epistle.

117. 9, 3:1, 4:14, 6:20, 7:22, 10:19, 12:2, 24, 13:12.

118. 7:14. 119. 2:14, 17. 120. 2:6-9.

121. 2:18; 4:15. 122. 5:7, 8.

123. 3:2; 5:5, 7; 12:2. 124. 12:2. 125. 5:8.

126. 2:10; 5:9; 7:28. 127. 2:18; 4:15. 128. 2:10; 5:8; 12:2.

129. ἀκατάλυτος , not capable of being broken to pieces or dissolved (cf. Thayer; Abbott-Smith, s. v.; Westcott; Dods, on 7:16.

130. 13:8. 131. ib. p. 428; cf. also MacNeille, ib. 97.

132. ib. p. 52. 133. 2:10, etc. 134. 2:17, 18. 135. 4:15.

136. 12:3. 137. 5:7, 8. 138. 2:9; 12:2.

139. 2:10; 5:9; 7:26-28.

140. 2:10.

141. ib. p. 50. 142. ib. II. 193. 143. ib. p. 500, "He experienced a normal moral development."

144. The Humiliation of Christ, p. 274. 145. ib. p. 285.

146. EGT, p. 265. 147. ib. p. 151f., emphasizing rather His official perfection more than His moral.

148. II. 307f. 149. 2:18; 4:15. 150. 5:9.

151. 9:22. 152. 8:1. 153. 12:2, etc.

154. Cf. 2:10 with 9:12, 23 ff.

CHAPTER XI

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF THE APOCALYPSE

As we have said with respect to other books, our primal interest in this discussion is not in the literary question of authorship but in the Christological content of the book. It is the portrait and not the painter we would study. This portrait of the Christ is here reproduced that we may compare it with others and so determine its place in the process of christological development in the New Testament.

1 *A Distinct Portrait.* Even if the author of the Fourth Gospel and the First Epistle of John is also the author of the Apocalypse, as held by most conservatives and many liberals,[1] there is good reason for considering separately the Christology of the Apocalypse.[2] It occupies a conspicuous place in the evolution of Christology in the New Testament period. Hence it is necessary to reproduce the Christ-portrait of the Apocalypse, if we would compare its Christology with those of Paul and the Epistle to the Hebrews, on the one hand, which antedate it, and with the Johannine Christology which may or may not follow it.

2 *An Incidental Picture of Christ.* The writer is not writing, as in the Fourth Gospel and in the First Epistle,[3] to set forth his Christology, or particular phases of it. He is writing to show that the struggle between good and evil must ultimately and certainly result in victory for the good; that Christianity, led by the suffering, militant Lamb, shall conquer Satan and the world powers, represented by the Roman Empire and its religion.[4] But in the description of the struggle he applies to the Lamb terms and ascribes to Him attributes and achievements and privileges which enable us to reproduce the portrait of Christ which he saw and painted.

3 *The Portrait a Late Development in New Testament Christology.* The late date of the Apocalypse is almost generally adopted by both conservative and liberal critics.[5] As Charles

says,[6] the Christology of the Apocalypse "is very comprehensive." If we knew that the Apocalypse was written before the Fourth Gospel, we could say that its Christology forms an easy transition from the Christology of Hebrews to the Christology of John. However, it is not difficult to determine which is the higher development, the Christology of the Apocalypse or the Christology of the Fourth Gospel. The latter is, without a doubt, the climax of christological development in the New Testament.

3 *The Historical Sources.* Whence did the Christian Apocalyptist gather the materials out of which he constructed his Christology? Changing the figure, from what sources did he draw the varying features of his Christ-portrait?

(1) *The Early Christian Tradition.* If the author is John the Apostle it would not be tradition but the reminiscences which he had of the early Christian events and teachings—especially of the teachings of Jesus, and the rapid progress of the gospel under the early Spirit-filled Apostles. If John the Elder is the author he found in this tradition his source of Jesus as the Messiah, and possibly the idea (or suggestion) of His being "the King of kings and Lord of lords."[7] In 1:13-18 he presents a picture of Jesus as "one like unto a Son of man," which Charles declares to be a messianic expression.[8] The idea of His Kingship is involved in His messiahship and so is traceable to the teachings of Jesus. So we are safe in predicating the early teachings of Jesus and the early tradition of the same as a source whose materials and ideas are found throughout the Apocalypse. Charles thinks it likely that the author used Matthew and Luke, James and First Peter.[9]

(2) *The Old Testament.* As to the content of the Christology, this source could furnish only messianic hints and suggestions; but as to the expression and imagery of the christological picture in the Apocalypse, the Old Testament undoubtedly is the chief source. John was not only conversant but saturated with the Apocalyptic and messianic phraseology of the Old Testament. Of 404 verses 265 (according to WH Text) are, or contain, more or less direct quotations from the Old Testament.[10] The chief Old Testament books from which he drew material were Daniel, Zechariah, Ezekiel, Isaiah, Jeremiah, but he also used Numbers, Exodus, Hosea, Joel, the Psalms, etc.

(3) *Late (extra-canonic) Literature.* Especiallly is it to be noted that the messianic title "Lord of lords and King of kings"[11] is found in I Enoch 9:4. The Messiah's smiting of the nations with a sharp sword, which proceeds out of His mouth, and ruling them with a rod of iron, is paralleled in Psalms of Solomon 17:26f., 39. But this Psalm combines Isa. 11:4 and Ps. 2:9. So the Old Testament is the original, though the Pslams of Solomon be the immediate, source.[12] Also the use of the term Lamb as a Messianic title is found in this literature.[13] For the phrase "the throne of God and of the Lamb"[14] the author is likely influenced by a similar expression in I Enoch 6:2; 3:5, "the throne of God and of the Son of Man." The latter phrase is messianic, and so the author substitutes his favorite title of Jesus, "the Lamb." The principal extra-canonic books on which the author may have been somewhat dependent (for imagery) are I Enoch, Psalms of Solomon, and the Twelve Patriarchs (especially Levi).[15]

(4) *Pauline Epistles.* Since Paul was the pioneer in planting Christianity in Ephesus, John must have felt his spirit and heard reminiscences of him from the disciples of the Apostle to the Gentiles. Again, it is likely that John was in possession of some of the Pauline epistles (Thessalonians, I and II Corinthians, Colossians, and Ephesians.)[16] There are parallel christological features in Paul and the Apocalypse: "the Yea" and "Amen,"[17] "the First-born from the dead,"[18] "the beginning (of creation),"[19] He sits on the throne with the Father,[20] etc. These are some of the higher cosmic features of the Pauline Christology which are incorporated in the Christ-portrait of the Apocalypse.

(5) *Pagan Sources.* Charles thinks it was likely that the accounts of the struggle of the dragon with the woman,[21] and of the woman fleeing into the wilderness to escape from the flood caused by the dragon[22]; of the war between the dragon and Michael, are not taken from pagan sources, Babylonian,[23] or Persian,[24] or Greek,[25] or Egyptian,[26] but from Jewish sources.[27] The evidence adduced by this expert in apocalyptic literature makes it well nigh inevitable for us to conclude that the author did not use any pagan sources.[28]

(6) *The Author's Experience and the Roman Environment.* John must have had a pungent experience of the power of the Lamb in his own life. It is easy to posit this proposition on

the ground of the apostolic authorship. However, even John the Elder, too, could have belonged to the same school of prophets in Ephesus,[29] and so enjoyed a convincing experience of the conquering power of the Lamb. At any rate, He is a prophet. To have brought down upon his head the persecuting hand of the Imperial Government shows that he was an ardent votary of the Lamb, and just as ardent in his antagonism to the Caesar cult. So whatever literary sources he may have used, he put upon his apocalypse the Christian stamp, and his portrait of the Christ as the Lamb of God and the King of kings was the gradual outgrowth of his experience of the Lamb's power over the evil within and without. This experience leads him to the general conclusion that the Lamb must conquer the Caesar cult and all the world-powers of evil, and at last be crowned "Lord of lords, and King of kings."[30]

4 *Christ the Living Son.* We are now ready to trace the features of the Christ-portrait delineated in the Apocalypse. Who is this commanding figure at the head of the forces of good, who walks in the midst of the candlesticks of the churches, who has authority to open the seven seals, who sits at last upon "the throne of God and of the Lamb," and is hailed as King of kings?

(1) *The Eternal, Pre-existing Son.* The author describes Him as "the Living One," "alive forevermore,"[31] "the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last."[32] In harmony with this feature of His person, he calls Him Son (that is, calls God His "Father"), "the Son of God," or represents the glorified Christ as saying of God, "My Father,"[33] while he describes men as "becoming" sons of God.[34] That is, the Christ, the Lamb, *is* the Son of God, whereas men must *"become"* the sons of God. Of a surety, His Sonship is unique; yea, of a different order from that of men who follow the Lamb and "become" the sons of God. Charles unequivocally declares the author's meaning to be that Christ "is essentially" the Son of God, while men "become" the sons of God.[35] Comparing this title with the above expressions, "the Living one" who is "alive forevermore," "the Alpha and the Omega," etc., it is almost impossible, from the exegetical point of view, not to think of the Christ of the Apocalypse as an eternal, pre-existent Being; yea, verily, the eternal Son of God.[36]

(2) *The Son with Divine Attributes.* He is described in the

terms of Daniel (7:9) which are applied there to Jehovah the Ancient of Days[37]; He is praised by angels as God, or at least as a co-partner with God on the throne[38]; but He is never, as in the Pauline Epistles,[39] in Hebrews,[40] and in John,[41] called "God," but He is called "the Logos of God."[42] Moffatt thinks[43] "this passage reflects certain phases of later messianic belief in Judaism, which had been tinged by the Babylonian myth of Marduk." Certainly the term "Logos" is not used here, as in the Fourth Gospel, as the Revealer of God, but rather as "a stern, militant figure of vengeance attacking the rebellious." But He is victor over all His antagonists, and our author could not ascribe to Him such titles and attributes of Jehovah, and such a universal conquest, without accepting Him as superhuman, and in some sense, the eternal Son. The Lamb approximates the omniscience as well as the omnipotence of God.[44]

(3) *The Son "the Active Principle in Creation."* In our English versions this term (archee)[45] is translated "the beginning," but Charles positively asserts, apparently on good grounds,[46] that our author means to say that "the active principle in creation" is now addressing the church in Laodicea. This would ascribe to Christ "the cause" of creation (Charles) which sounds like the Philonic conception of the Logos as the agent of creation[47]; if not, in reality, a little bolder conception of the cosmic function of the Son. Moffatt[48] thinks, by the use of this title, the author "ascribes to Him that pre-existence —predicated of the Messiah in Jewish apocalyptic (cf. Enoch XLVIII)," but he does not commit himself to the view of a "personal" pre-existence. On the other hand, after carefully combining the above terms and the ideas conveyed, according to the principles of historical interpretation, all conservatives and many liberals commit themselves to the acceptance of a pre-existent, eternal Son as set forth by the Apocalypse.[49] Even Beyschlag,[50] Bousset,[51] and other extreme liberals, admit the Christ of the Apocalypse is represented as pre-existent, but being a Jewish mode of expression must not be interpreted in a literal sense to designate the "personal" pre-existence of the Son.

5 *The Human Jesus.* Boll[52] is not justified by the facts in asserting there "is no earthly Jesus in the Apocalypse." Yet there is little stress laid upon the humanity of Jesus. Like Paul, the author is interested rather in "the heavenly Christ"

than in the earthly Jesus. However, he generally uses the historical name, Jesus,[53] though sometimes the official title, Christ, or the Christ.[54] This suggests that He is giving us the picture of the Jesus of history; at least, that the pre-existent, eternal Son, the redeeming, conquering Lamb, and the King of kings, is identified with the Jesus of history. This is further established by his references to His lineage from Judah and David[55]; His association with "Apostles"[56]; to His being crucified[57]; risen,[58] and ascended.[59] However, he never seeks to emphasize the humanity of Jesus as a necessity or pre-requisite to a proper fulfillment of His redeeming mission, as did the author of Hebrews.[60] The features of the human Jesus are only slightly colored, very much as in the Pauline Epistles and the Gospel of John.

6 *The Lamb of God.* This is the author's favorite title of Christ. It occurs 28 times.[61] Charles[62] finds it is a messianic title in the later Jewish books; that in the Apocalypse it combines the two distinct ideas of "the Lamb as slain," and the Lamb as a leader, the first meaning being a "Christian development from Isaiah 53," the second being found in the later Jewish literature. That is, the Christ is pictured as the suffering victim and the victorious leader. The basal thought is that the Lamb by His sacrificial death redeems men to God and thereby makes possible His own triumph and the final victory of suffering Christians.

There can be little doubt that the two ideas set forth by the title Lamb are central in the Apocalypse. The figure of the Lamb is dominant in the drama; the features of the Lamb slain and yet conquering are central in this portrait. This is asserted by Charles,[63] and admitted by J. Weiss,[64] but Vischer[65] and most extreme liberals seek to show that the Lamb passages are "interpolations"; that the Apocalypse itself is only a crazy quilt composed of fragments from "Jewish apocalypses" and "edited" by a later Christian hand.

The Lamb is the Suffering Redeemer. The primal idea in the term is that He is a "slain Lamb."[66] The redemptive idea occurs also under the figure of "the blood." To Christ is ascribed glory and power forever because He "loosed us from our sins in His own blood."[67] The idea of a price paid for our "loosing" is not present; and yet the death of Christ is thought of as the means of "loosing us from our sins.[68] The Lamb is

worthy of receiving universal praise and power because He was slain[69]; He has authority to open the seals because He bought us with His blood[70]; the redeemed have made their robes white in the blood of the Lamb[71]; they conquered because of the blood of the Lamb[72]; the roster of the redeemed is the Lamb's book of life[73]; the redeemed are said to have been "bought from among men as first-fruits unto God and the Lamb"[74]; the song of redemption is the song of Moses and the Lamb (that is, as Moses delivered from Egyptian bondage, the Lamb delivers from the bondage of sin)[75]; the redeemed are the bride prepared for the Lamb and are to enjoy the nuptial feast with Him[76]; He is associated with God as the temple and the light of the New Jerusalem[77]; He is co-regent with God on the throne.[78] These lines in the picture suggest:— (1) The death of the Lamb is the means of redemption and deliverance from our sins. (2) By virtue of His sacrifice He has received authority to open the seals of the book.[79] (3) Because of His sacrificial death He becomes the conquering warrior, "the Lion of the tribe of Judah."[80] (4) By virtue of His death His followers also conquer and are closely bound to Him by the bond of redemption, a bond as intimate as that of husband and wife. (5) By virtue of His death He is deemed worthy of universal praise. (6) And so He occupies the throne of God as co-regent.[81] (7) Yea, because of His sacrifice as the Lamb, and by virtue of His "love" the cause of the sacrifice (1:5), He becomes the center of worship and the source of light in the New Jerusalem. From His face flashes the glory of God and to Him the hallelujahs of the new song are sung by the multitude which no tongue can number.[82]

7 *"The King of Kings."* As intimated above, the Lordship and Kingship of the Lamb is a logical conclusion, if one accepts the premises of the Apocalyptic author. To emphasize His dominion, based upon His conquest by redemption, he repeatedly calls Him Lord of lords and King of kings, or expresses the idea in other imagery.[83] He moves in the midst of the candlesticks of the churches which signifies that He is supreme in the government of the churches.[84] He borrows from Daniel 7:13 the symbol "son of man" which has a royal significance in the Old Testament apocalypse.[85] He also is represented as ruling the nations with a rod of iron, and even as "ruler of the kings of earth,"[86] which suggests His universal supremacy on earth.

He exercises dominion over church and state. He is the supreme ruler of earth. However, the author does not, as does Paul,[87] ascribe to Him cosmic dominion; that is, no dominion beyond the earth is predicated of Him, unless it be implied in the general phrase, "the throne of God and of the Lamb."[88] But it is clear that there is no emphasis in the Apocalypse on a cosmic dominion of Christ.

Moreover, He is associated with God as Judge in the messianic kingdom prior to the final judgment.[89] It is not asserted that He presides as Judge in the final assize, but He is the dispenser of blessings to individual Christians,[90] and sometimes rebukes and chastises them.[91] He is one before whose "wrath" the mighty workers of evil shall not be able to stand.[92] But it is the Father alone who presides at the final judgment.[93] So there is a subordination to God implied in the Lamb's Lordship in the church and in His dominion over the earth.[94]

8 *The Unity of the Picture.* The eternal Sonship of Christ is not a fiction. By the use of the title Jesus (more than any other except that of the Lamb) He paints His portrait of the Son around the Jesus of history. But the historical Jesus is the Alpha and the Omega. He existed in eternity before He became the Jesus of history. As the eternal Son and the historical Jesus He became the Lamb. His eternal Sonship lends dignity and worth to His sacrificial death. The author takes great pains in painting Him as the personal, eternal, pre-existing Son before he paints Him as the Lamb who was slain from the foundation of the world for the redemption from sin.[95] Yet the Lamb-features of the Christ form the centre of the Christ-portrait in the Apocalypse. As Moffatt puts it[96]: "Christ crucified and risen is the centre. To Him all things bow and sing."[97] And so His Kingship is based upon His sacrificial death. Because He is the Lamb slain, He is the victorious leader of the hosts of good against the powers of evil. "The victory has been won through His death and resurrection."[98] He is rewarded for His sufferings by being exalted to the throne of God. The law of sacrifice has operated in His case to lead to victory and the throne. It is also operative in the lives of His saints to bring them, through their sufferings and the washing in His blood, to victory and the throne.[99]

9 *Resumé.* In this portrait of Christ we see the following features are prominent:— (1) The sacrificial death of the

Lamb gives color to the whole Christology of the Apocalypse. The suffering Christ is stressed more than by Paul, but perhaps not quite so much as by the author of Hebrews. (2) The human Jesus. as in Hebrews, furnishes the historical background and makes the point of contact between the eternal Son and the suffering Lamb. The Son and the Lamb of the Apocalypse is the Jesus of history. (3) The eternal Sonship is prominent but not quite so minutely elaborated as by Paul and Hebrews, and by far less conspicuous than in the Fourth Gospel. (4) The exaltation of Christ transcends, by far, that in Hebrews, and possibly that in Paul. However, at one point, the cosmic exaltation, Paul transcends the Apocalypse. (5) In the Apocalypse there is no touch of the mystical union with Christ, as in Paul and John—except in the bridal relation of the redeemed to the Lamb.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XI

1. So Beyschlag,, Weiss, Zahn, Belser, Fourand, Stevens Sheldon, Vedder, Swete, Robertson (A. T.), W. B. Hill, et al.
2. As do Beyschlag, Weiss, Stevens, Sheldon, Feine, and others, in their N. T. Ths.
3. Cf. chap. I. on Literary Sources, for the various views as to the authorship of these books.
4. So Swete, The Apocalypse of St. John, '07; Moffatt, EGT; Charles, Rev. of Jno. ICC, et al.
5. So Weizsäcker. H. J. Holtzmann, Harnack, Jülicher, Bousset, Zahn, Reinach, Dods, Milligan, Sanday, Ramsay, McGiffert, Bacon, Porter, Votaw, Goodspeed, Swete, Moffatt, W. B. Hill, Charles, et al.
6. ib. p. CX.
7. 2:27; 12:5; 17:14; 19:15, 16.
8. ib. I. 27. 9. I. LXXXIIIf.
10. Cf. Charles, I. LXVff. for a lengthy list of O. T. passages used by our author. He thinks he used, in the main, the Heb. text.
11. 17:14 (cf. 19:16). 12. Cf. Charles I. p. LXXXIII.
13. Cf. Charles, ib. CXIII (in Enoch, Testament of Twelve Pats.) Cf. also Burkitt, Jewish and Christian Apocalypses, '14, for the extra-canonic Apocalypses as sources.
14. 22:2.
15. Cf. Charles, I. LXXXIIf. for complete list of extra-canonic passages. 16. So Charles, I. LXXXIV-LXXXVI; also p. 94, for specific influence of Col. 1:15, 18 on Rev. 1:5; 3:14. 17. Rev. 1:7, 2 Cor. 1:20. 18. Rev. 1:5, Col. 1:18. 19. Rev. 3:14,

Col. 1:18.

20. Rev. 3:21, Col. 3:1. 21. 12:1-5. 22. 12:12-17. 23. So Gunkel, (all of chap. 12) Schöpfung und Chaos, but he retracts, Verständnis, s. 55, 379ff.

24. So Völter, Offenbarung Johnnis, Iv. 1904. 25. So Dieterich, Abraxas, 117 ff. 26. So Bousset, Offenbarung Joh. '06. 27. Which may have been taken from Babylonian or Greek sources.

28. Charles thinks many of these stories belong to the "international" stock of religious views concerning a "World-Redeemer"; so Gunkel in his Verständnis, 55; Cheyne, Bib. Probs. 195, 206.

29. Cf. Moffatt, INT, p. 615 ff.

30. 17:14; cf. 19:16; 22:2.

31. 1:17, 18.

32. 2:8; 22:13. 33. 1:6; 2:18, 28; 3:5, 21; 14:1.

34. 2:7. 35. ib. CX. 36. Cf. Moffatt, on 1:17, 18, who speaks of "the eternal life of the exalted Messiah," but on 2:18, he says the title "Son of God" is an "equivalent for Messiah"; cf. Kattenbusch, Das Apos. Symbol, II. 563 f. 37. 1:14, 15; cf. Charles, ad loc. 38. 5:13, where Charles, I. 135, says: "The countless host of angels praise the Lamb as God."

39. Rom. 9:5. 40. 1:8. 41. 1:1, 18. 42. 19:13.

43. EGT, on 19:13, (fol. Michael, En. LXIX. 14).

44. 5:6, has "seven eyes" which in Zech. 4:10, refer to Jehovah; cf. Charles ad loc. 45. 3:14.

46. On 3:14; also I, p. CXII. 47. So Beyschlag, II. 380ff; Moffatt, ib. on 3:14. 48. As above.

49. So Lechler, Zeitalt, apos. u. nachapos.; Reuss, Hist. The Chrét. 18-52; Gebhardt, Doc. of Apoc. 1873; Briggs, The Messiah of the Apostles; Stevens, ib. 538 f.; Schlatter, ib. II. 144ff.; Weiss, II. sec. 134; Sheldon, ib. p. 163; F. C. Porter, Rev., HDB; Orr, Rev. Int. St. Bib. Enc.; Ramsay, Letters to the Seven Churches; Swete, Apoc. of St. Jno.; Charles, ib. CXIf.; Gore, ib. p. 126 (speaks of Christ's "co-existence with God"), and others.

50. ib. II. 380. 51. ib. ad loc.

52. Aus der Offenbarung Johannis, '14, on ch. 12. 53. 1:9; 12:17, 14:12, etc. 2, 11:15, 12:10, 20:4, 6; cf.

54. 1:1, 2; 5, 22:21, where the titles are combined, as in Paul.

55. 5:5. 56. 21:14. 57. 11:8. 58. 1:5, 18.

59. 3:2, 12:5. 60. 2:9-18; cf. previous chap.

61. Grk. ἀρνίον (ἀμνός in John):—5:6, 8, 13; 6:1, 16; 7:9, 10, 14, 17; 12:11; 13:8; 14:1, 4, 10; 15:3; 17:14; 19:7, 9; 21:9, 14, 22, 27, 22:2, 3.

62. ib. CXIII, n. 1—esp. in I Enoch 89:45, 48; 90; 6, 8, 38; Test. of XII. Pats., Reub. 6:7-12, etc.

63. ib. p. 141. 64. Offenbarung Joh. p. 57.

65. Cf. his Offenbarung Joh. TU. II. 3, 1897.

66. 5:6. 67. 1:5, 6.

68. Cf. Charles, Moffatt, ad loc. 69. 5:6, 8, 13.

70. 5:9; cf. 6:1, 16. 71. 7:14. 72. 12:11. 73. 13:8; 21:

27. 74. 14:4. 75. 15:3. 76. 19:7, 9; cf. 21:9.
77. 21:22, 23. 78. 22: 1, 3. 79. The book of "the counsels and judgments of God," especially of "the future," "the book of destiny," which are "a profound secret," (so Charles I. 138).
80. So Charles; cf. him on 5:5.
81. 2:21, etc. 82. 7:9.
83. 2:27; 12:5; 17:14; 19:15, 16, etc. 84. 1:13, 16; 2:1.
85. 1:13; cf. Charles, ad loc.
86. 2:27; 12:5; 17:14; 19:15, 16; Marduk, King of Babylon, had this exact title, "Lord of lords and King of kings"; cf. Pfleiderer, The Early Christian Conception of Christ, p. 140f.; Schrader-Zimmern, Die Keilinschriften u. das. A. T. 374, 402.
87. Cf. Phil. 2:10, 11; Eph. 1:20, 21, etc.
88. 22:1, 3: cf. also 2:27, etc. 89. 14:14, 18-20.
90. 2:7, 11, 17, 26-28. 91. Chs. 2 and 3; cf. Charles, I, CXII. 92. 6:17. 93. 20:11-15.
94. Cf. Charles, I, CXII, and on 4:11; 14:7.
95. Cf. Rev. 1:4ff. for the picture of the eternal Son; cf. chs. 7, 14, etc., for the picture of the redeeming Lamb. 96. EGT, V. 384.
97. So even J. Weiss, ib. above; also Charles, ib; Weiss, Bib. Th. II. 273f., Com. II. 412; Beyschlag, II. 373f., Stevens, 542. Cf. also Swete, Porter, Orr, Sheldon, Feine, Weinel, et al. for agreement with this view. 98. Charles, ib. 99. 7:14.

CHAPTER XII

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF JOHN

In the development of New Testament Christology we reach the climax in the writings of John, especially in his Gospel. The process of development has continued from Paul and Hebrews to John, until in the Johannine Gospel and Epistle we reach the climax of the Christological development. There is possibly some reaction from extreme views emphasized in the Pauline Christology, but in the main there is going on a normal development until the climax is reached in the "School of Johns."

1 *Literary Problems.* These have been discussed in chapter I. For our present discussion it makes no difference whether the Gospel and Epistle were written by John the Apostle or John the Elder.[1] It is the Christ-portrait we would discover. With a reasonable certainty of the apostolic authorship we must be satisfied. However, if some day it should be proved that not John the Apostle but John the Elder, or some other John, painted this "Rembrandt" portrait of the Christ, the portrait itself can not be harmed or changed by the results of literary criticism. In this attitude toward the literary problems we proceed to discover and reproduce the Christ-portrait of John's Gospel and Epistle.

2 *The Unity of the Portrait.* Is the portrait of Christ in the Gospel harmonious with that in the Epistle? Some scholars think not, and on the ground of the differing, if not contradicting, Christologies in the Gospel and the Epistle, deny the identity of authorship.[2] However, most liberals and all conservatives accept the identity of authorship and the unity of the Christ-portrait. Although the Gospel stresses the majestic *Divine Christ* and the Epistle emphasizes the real human Jesus, the two are but phases of the same harmonious picture. The same process of stressing the eternal Sonship and the human Jesus is to be found in the Epistle to the Hebrews,[3] whose portrait of Christ no critic has ever yet charged with being an inharmonious picture of the Christ. Indeed, it requires the blend-

ing of the features of Christ in the Gospel with those found in the Epistle to give us the complete, symmetrical Christ of the latter half of the first century, who, if not exactly identical with the Jesus of history, finds His general form and the expression of His life and love in harmony therewith.[4]

3 *A Designed Portrait.* While the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews did not set out to paint the portrait of the person of Christ but to discuss His High Priestly sacrifice, John in the Gospel had an apologetic aim in writing, namely, to prove that the Jesus known in the flesh was the eternal Logos and the pre-existing Son of God. He sought to counteract the destructive influence of the Gnostics who denied the eternal Sonship of Jesus and placed Him as an aeon in the scale of imaginary intermediaries between God and man. On the other hand, the author of the Epistle set out to prove that the eternal Son of God was a real man in the flesh. He was measuring swords with Cerinthus and the Docetists who claimed that Jesus was not a real man[5] and that the Messiah descended upon Him at the baptism but left Him before the crucifixion. John seeks to prove the opposite; that the Son of God had become actual human "flesh"; that by personal contact and spiritual experience he had come to know Him as such, and that His real humanity is as necessary a part of true Christology as His Deity, or Divine Sonship.

4 *The Jesus of History and the Christ of John.* As intimated in an earlier chapter,[6] there is a long road of Christology making stretching from the Logia to John. Bacon, Wendling, Pfleiderer, Wrede, Lagrange, and other extreme liberals, deny that even the Christ of Mark is the Jesus of history.[7] Paul, they say, was the first Christology maker; Mark is "a radical Paulinist" who is reproducing the Pauline Christ and not the Jesus of history. If this conclusion be accepted, then the Christ of John is at an unspeakable distance from the Jesus of history. Without a doubt, the Christ of the Fourth Gospel is the product of philosophical reflection by a theologian, not the simple narrative of a historian. The author is an apologist who is painting the Christ of the church (at least of the majority) at the end of the first century, and not the Jesus of history who appeared at the beginning of the century. But taking together the Christology of the Johannine Gospel and Epistle, we have the Christology of the majority of Christians at the close of the

first century; a Christology which blends, as does the Christology of Hebrews, the Jesus of history and the eternal Son of God. So while the Gospel seems to ignore the actual Jesus of history for the eternal Son, the Epistle stresses the reality of the human Jesus, and thus identifies the eternal Son with the Jesus of history.[8]

5 *The Historical Sources.* Among the students of the Johannine writings there is no unaminity of opinion as to the order of importance for the various historical sources contributing to the Christ-portrait painted therein. Scarcely are they agreed as to *what sources* actually made contributions to the Johannine Christology. As to the order of significance it seems reasonable to present these sources as follows:—

(1) *The Author's Originality.* There is a Johannine stamp on everything he takes from any external source. His originality is as marked as that of Paul or the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. He absorbs from various sources thoughts and forms and expressions, but all are passed through the melting-pot of personal experience and stamped Johannine. Moffatt expresses it thus:[9] "The starting-point of his work is a deep religious experience of Jesus as the revelation of the Father." Scott expresses it even more emphatically: "He *informs* whatever is given him with his own peculiar spirit; it ceases to be Pauline, Philonic or Gnostic, and becomes simply the thought of John." Again, John "is the most individual[10] of New Testament writers," and makes "radical modifications" of the Philonic doctrine of the Logos. These modifications are due to the author's religious experience and originality. A similar view of John's originality is expressed by B. Weiss,[11] Beyschlag,[12] Schlatter,[13] Stevens,[14] Sheldon,[15] J. Weiss,[16] G. T. Purvis,[17] Burney,[18] Garvie,[19] Gore,[20] and others.

(2) *The Old Testament.* It is difficult to determine which, the Old Testament or the Synoptics, contributed the more to Johannine Christology. The primal roots are in the Old Testament; the elements of new Christian truths nourishing those roots, and to some extent shaping the new olive tree of Johannine thought, are found in the primitive Christian ideas preserved in the Synoptic Gospels. But since the root ideas, or suggestions, from which was developed the Johannine Christology, are in the Old Testament, it is fitting that we place it at the head of the list of external sources.

The older conservative scholars laid much stress upon this source for the Christology of John. Meyer[21] regards the Logos doctrine of the Fourth Gospel as rooted in the Old Testament and allows but little influence from Alexandrianism. So does B. Weiss,[22] allowing much to the influence of John's experience and originality. He thinks the Logos doctrine is derived from the Old Testament. Stevens[23] thinks that John acknowledges the Old Testament as the word of God; still Christianity is a "higher religion" than that of the Old Testament; the Logos doctrine is found to be rooted in the Old Testament. Godet's[24] view is that John recognized the Old Testament religion as "Divine" and that "Christianity is related to it." Beyschlag[25] holds that "all fundamental conceptions grow out of the Old Testament." Also the recent scholars are emphasizing this source of Johannine Christology. Alexander[26] thinks that both Philo and John found their doctrine of the Logos in the Old Testament (and in the Jewish theology). J. Rendell Harris[27] thinks John is more indebted to the Old Testament than to the Greek philosophy. Burney[28] is more emphatic than Professor Harris for the Old Testament as the source-book of John; it even had an Aramaic original translated into Greek. Bishop Gore,[29] even more recently, speaks of "the properly Jewish meaning" of the term Logos. On the other hand, many modern liberals disregard or minimize the influence of the Old Testament on the Johannine thought. For instance Moffat[30] does not stress it as "one of the main currents which flow through the Gospel," although tacitly admitting its importance as a source. Also Scott,[31] although he once admits that "in its fundamental thoughts the prologue is more directly related to the Old Testament than to Philo," nevertheless minimizes this source of the Logos doctrine. However, not many of the recent scholars go as far as Renan[32] and Baur,[33] Hilgenfeld[34] and Reuss,[35] in regarding the author as "opposed to the Old Testament religion," or as having "a lively antipathy" to it. The facts show that John is steeped in the thought-forms and expressions of the Old Testament religion, but his experience of Christ as "the way, the truth, and the life,"[36] along with certain external influences, makes him think of Christianity as the religion of "truth and grace," and therefore of Christ the Son as superior to Moses.[37] For John the Old Testament is an impor-

tant starting-point,[38] but experience has put its stamp upon every thing suggested by the Old Testament.

(3) *The Synoptic Gospels.* Scholars are by no means agreed as to how much the Johannine writings are indebted to the Synoptic Gospels. They are regarded as significant sources by *O. Holtzmann,*[39] *Moffatt*[40] (especially Mark), *Zahn*[41] (who thinks that even the "lack of skill" in arranging the Synoptic material is evidence of "dependence"); *Beyschlag*[42]; Schlatter[43] (especially Matthew); *J. Weiss,*[44] who thinks the author "had in view the Synoptic Gospels"; Stanton[45]; *Scott,*[46] especially in the narratives, and Loisy.[47] On the other hand, Baur[48] thought the influence of the Synoptics on John very "small." So does B. Weiss,[49] although he does not, by any means, accept most of the conclusions of Baur. Nor do Stevens and Sheldon[50] lay any stress upon the Synoptics as sources of John.

If John the Apostle is the author, it may be claimed that he does not need the Synoptic Gospels as sources; he was an "eye-witness." But almost two generations had passed since the earthly career of Jesus had closed. So even an Apostle, who had been an eye-witness, would naturally, in meeting such a gigantic doctrinal peril as Gnosticism, look into the Synoptic Gospels, now steadily being accepted as the authoritative sources of Jesus' life and teachings.[51] Especially would this be natural for him, since he was grafting his doctrine of the metaphysical Sonship of Jesus on to the historical Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels.[52] Although John is moving, with his Logos conception, in the realms of theology and philosophy, he is careful to give it a historical mooring and an ethical coloring. These he finds in the Synoptic Gospels.

(4) *Paulinism.* On this point the Johannine experts cross swords; Reuss[53] emphasized Paulinism as the starting-point for the development of the higher doctrines, as Christology, especially union with Christ, and kindred ideas. Schlatter[54] ascribes much influence to Paul, but characterizes John as an *"independent"* thinker. *Moffatt*[55] puts it very emphatically: "On the cardinal topics, as union with Christ, freedom, and life in relation to the glorified Christ, he has developed his theology from Pauline germs." Scott says,[56] "The evangelist is everywhere indebted to Paul"; especially does he think so as to his doctrine of Sonship of Christ. Bacon[57] accuses John of "copying" certain phases of Paul's Christology. Deissmann[58] calls

the Fourth Gospel "the Pauline Gospel through and through." Bousset[59] thinks John "builds on Paul" in making "the Lord the Spirit"; in development of his doctrine of "Logos-Son of God," and "Christ-mysticism."

On the other hand, the Pauline influence on John is not considered by Weiss, Stevens, Sheldon,[60] as a shaping force. More recently Bishop Gore[61] contends that Paul did not influence John's Christology. A careful study of the literary and the historical facts; that is, the facts of the two Christologies with a rigid comparison of the same; the recognized fact that the author, whether John the Apostle, or John the Elder or another John, according to early Christian tradition, succeeded Paul as the leader and became influential in Ephesus,[62] must lead us to the conclusion that Paul, being the founder of these churches and the writer of the epistles addressed to some of them, and being an extra-ordinarily strong personality, necessarily influenced the Christology of John. Especially is it likely that the Epistle to the Colossians (with Ephesians) was known to John. If so, it is incredible that the highly developed Christology of Colossians made no, or little, impression on the cosmic thoughts of John. The eternal cosmic functions and relations of John's Logos are in Colossians 1:15-20.

(5) *Alexandrianism.* As on the above points, so here, the scholars differ widely. The older Biblical theologians, as Weiss,[63] Beyschlag,[64] Stevens,[65] and expositors, as Meyer,[66] Godet,[67] Westcott,[68] either minimize Alexandrianism as a shaping force in the Christology of John, or ascribe to the Old Testament, or to later Jewish theology, the chief influence; especially as to the Logos doctrine. Dods[69] thinks John finds the Logos doctrine "already" in use in the Hebrew and Hellenistic thought-worlds. Zahn[70] goes the length of supposing that the Logos doctrine had already been accepted in the churches of Asia. So for Dods and Zahn Alexandrianism is excluded as a direct source.

Recently, however, the pendulum of thought is swinging in the other direction. Holtzmann,[71] and J. Revillle,[72] and Friedländer,[73] the first emphatically, the second uncompromisingly, the third not so uncompromisingly but emphatically, had traced the Logos doctrine of John to Philo, and thus paved the way for E. F. Scott,[74] who traces to Philonism "the use of the term Logos, a dominant conception of the Gospel"; "the use of

allegory" and "special passages paralleled in Philo." Philo speaks of his Logos as "imitating the ways of his Father," which Scott thinks suggests the Johannine expression, "The Son can do nothing of Himself, but what" etc. Philo's statement, "The Logos distributes to all the heavenly food," is the source of the teaching that Christ is "the bread of life."[75] Although he predicates considerable Alexandrian influence in the Logos doctrine of John, yet he speaks of the Philonic idea as "submitted" to "radical modifications."[76] *Moffatt*[77] considers Alexandrianism as one of "four primal sources" of John, the other three being the Old Testament, Paulinism, and Stoicism. *Feine*[78] emphasizes the Philonic influences.

On the other hand, many recent writers are minimizing the Philonic influence on the Christology of John: As Burney,[79] who thinks that the Logos doctrine of John may be traced to the Old Testament idea expressed by the later Aramaic term memra. Ed. Meyer[80] also minimizes Philonic influence. Bishop Gore[81] speaks of the Logos as having "its proper Jewish meaning," but also its "Hellenistic" meaning.[82]

At the same time, it is undoubtedly in harmony with the facts to magnify the differences between Philo and John, rather than the resemblances. The contrasts are much more striking than the likenesses. Grill,[83] Harnack,[84] and Peake,[85] (and even Scott[86] admits it) have laid great stress upon the higher spiritual, personal significance of the term in the Christology of John. After a careful study of the two Logos doctrines these contrasts are evident:

(1) The Logos idea of Philo is a purely *philosophical* explanation of the relation of God and His cosmos; the Logos doctrine of John, although couched in a philosophical term, is *intensely religious,* the author seeking to show *how* God works in His world, and *how* men may have "life," or fellowship with God.

(2) The Logos of Philo is not a person but an "emanation" from God, but often personified; the Logos of John is a person —the eternal Son of God who is *identified,* by incarnation, with the Jesus of history.

(3) The Logos of Philo is limited to cosmic functions; the Logos of John, although as the eternal Son enjoying cosmic relations and functions, also has a *redemptive* function; He is,

as the incarnate Son, "lifted up," that men might have life in Him."[87]

To summarize our conclusions as to Alexandrianism as a possible source: Since John was writing to *Hellenistic* Christians in Ephesus, a centre of the current philosophy in which the Logos doctrine was prominent, he likely adopted the term from the *Hellenistic* source; that is, he would not have presented his *Christology* under the Logos form,, had he not found it in the current thought of his environment. In this way he finds a ready-made vehicle of truth for presenting to his *contemporaries* his higher Christology. But, true to his Jewish inheritance and training, he modified the current Logos idea to harmonize with the Old Testament teaching of a *personal* God who works in His world through His "Word." He further modified it so as to make it *harmonize* with his Christian experience of Jesus as the eternal Logos and Son of God, who has become to him the *Revealer* of God and the *Redeemer* of men.

(6) *Stoicism.* Moffatt[88] claims that there is "a fairly direct contact of the Fourth Gospel with Stoic propaganda." Especially, he claims, is this to be seen in the clauses of the prologue, "In the beginning was the Logos and the Logos was God." He thinks they "might have been written literally by a Stoic." He thinks he sees the influence of Stoicism[89] in the "emphasis upon the self-possession of Jesus." Dods[90] hints at the possibility of Stoic influence by quoting from Marcus Aurelius the Stoic who uses the Greek expression spermatikos logos, which means "the word which has in it the seed of life." So John writes of Christ the Logos, "In Him was life."[91] E. V. Arnold,[92] on the other hand, possibly hits the nail on the head when he concedes some Stoic influence on Paul but thinks it was only "an indirect influence" on John. Since John inserts between the two Stoic-sounding clauses (so Moffatt above) the clause, "and the Logos was with God," a Jewish or Jewish Alexandrian idea, we are not warranted in predicting a direct Stoic influence on John's Logos doctrine. He may have imbibed some of their philosophical ideas, but did not consciously borrow their idea of the Logos or their doctrine of "self-possession" so *beautifully* illustrated in the life of Jesus.

(7) *Gnosticism.* Extreme views are entertained on the relation of John's Gospel to Gnosticism. Kreyenbühl[93] thought it was written by a Gnostic or Gnostics; Hilgenfeld,[94] that the

author went "a considerable distance along with Gnosticism." Baur supposed "the author aimed to introduce anti-Jewish Gnosticism" to his readers. So thinks Feine.[95] Scott,[96] however, has sanely concluded that "in the conception of the work of Christ, as well as in that of His person, a Gnostic influence is distinctly traceable"; also "the Gnostic antithesis of "two worlds" is accepted as "the framework of the Gospel."[97] On the other hand, he states it as his opinion that "the first aim of the author was to counteract the heretical teaching."[98] To sum up: we conclude that John likely borrowed Gnostic terms and a few Gnostic ideas, but he put into the terms a spiritual content and transformed the ideas so as to magnify the person and work of Christ.[99]

6 *The Portrait of Christ in John.* On the face of the terms employed to characterize the Christ, His person and His work, we have reached the climax of the evolution of the New Testament Christology. But we must study the Johannine terms and evaluate his portrait before we can safely assert such conclusion.

(1) *The Logos.* In the prologue of the Gospel[100] we find the author's Logos doctrine outlined.[101] It is clear that John's Logos is a personality. To the Stoics the Logos was eternal reason pervading the entire universe[102]; to the author of the Proverbs[103] Wisdom was a semi-personification; to the author of the Book of Wisdom,[104] an actual personification; to Philo, his Logos was sometimes a "semi-independence," or semblance of personality,[105] but to John the Logos is a historical personality. Moffatt positively asserts:[106] "John's Logos is historical and personal."

This personality is eternal. "In the beginning was the Logos." The Stoic also ascribed to his Logos pre-existence, but only as a principle.[107] The expression, "in the beginning," reminds one of Genesis 1:1,[108] and there can be no doubt that in John's mind the Logos existed, not only prior to the birth of the Jesus of history, but before the creation. Yea, He was in a state of intimate personal relationship with God. "And the Logos was with God."[109] The preposition "with" means "towards," "before the face," "face to face,"[110] and expresses the most intimate relationship and fellowship between the Logos and God. Indeed, it is so intimate that John could write, "And the Logos was God." The article is absent from the word

God to emphasize quality and "God" is placed at the head of the clause for special emphasis. "And *God* was the Logos." With a double emphasis he asserts the Logos to be God.

But in what sense is the Logos God? A historical study of the Hebrew and Greek word for God shows that the term refers to human judges,[111] to angels,[112] to heathen gods,[113] to Philo's Logos,[114] to Augustus ("Zeus") and to Nero as emperors,[115] as well as to Jehovah (very often) and to Christ by Paul, Hebrews and John. This loose use of the term furnishes those wishing to minimize the Deity of Christ lexical and historical grounds for their view.[116] But Stevens[117] is right in saying Philo used the term "in a figurative sense." But could John be using it in "a figurative sense"? He has just asserted the personality, pre-existence, and intimate personal relationship of the Logos with God. At the same stroke of his pen he asserts, with the strongest emphasis known to the Greek language,[118] that He is God (Theos). Therefore, little doubt can be felt that, to John, the Logos shares in the Divine "essence"; He is one in nature with God.[119]

The Logos is the mediating Creator of the cosmos. John declares that the universe was made, not ultimately but mediately,[120] by the Logos. So although the Logos has just been declared to be "God" in the "essence" of His nature, yet he says he has a subordinate part in the creation.[121] He is only the creative principle or medium, not the ultimate agent, of creation.[122] It is well to observe that this is not to say that John is discussing the cosmic relations and functions of the Logos from a metaphysical point of view. His religious experience of the incarnate Logos has led him to assert His participation in the Divine nature. [123]

He is also the Revealer of God and the Mediator of life. Philo had called his Logos "spring of life."[124] The same Greek expression (in Sept.) occurs in Ps. 36:9 with reference to Jehovah. The life in the Logos is closely related to light. "In Him was life and the life was the light of men."[125] While Holtzmann[126] and Weiss[127] limit this illumination to the incarnate Logos, most expositors think it refers to a general illumination by the pre-incarnate Logos.[128] But especially in the incarnate state does John think of the Logos as revealing grace and truth, and the "glory" of the Father.[129] This incarnation of the Logos was absolutely necessary that He might give a true-to-life

"exegesis"[130] of God's grace and truth. Moses made only an imperfect revelation of God[131]; it was left to the "Logos made flesh"[132] to make the perfect revelation of Him.

(2) *"The Son."* Does the Logos idea persist throughout the Gospel? Harnack[133] has championed a negative reply, holding that the prologue is only a preface. The majority of scholars take for granted that the Logos idea continues throughout the treatise. Especially in recent years has this view been championed by E. F. Scott,[134] Moffatt,[135] Holland,[136] and Belser.[137] Moffatt thinks the prologue "organic to the conception of the book"; Holland, "the full and ultimate conclusion," as if the philosophy of faith (in John) is contained in it; while Scott holds that the "philosophical theory" of the Logos "remains" beyond the prologue, even though the author defines the nature of Jesus with other conceptions more adequate to a personal and historical life."[138] Dean Inge[139] also claims that the author is not engaged in "a metaphysical abstraction, but idealizing (showing the highest significance of) a historical figure." So we may feel sure that the lofty ideas connoted by the term Logos in the prologue are expressed in the remaining symbols, Son, shepherd, light, life, vine, etc., of the Fourth Gospel.[140]

This is true of the term "the Son." The Logos was face to face with God. His relation to God was that of Son. This is the author's favorite title, occurring 18 times in the Gospel, 22 times in the Epistle. In the Gospel the Baptist and Nathaniel call Jesus Son of God, the author represents Jesus as claiming to be the Son,[141] but especially the term represents his own conception of the person of Christ.[142] In the Epistle a few passages emphasize the credal idea,[143] but most of them refer to His mediatorial mission fulfilled by His sacrificial death,[144] while only one refers to His relation to God.[145]

But what is the nature of this Divine Sonship so prominent in the Johannine Gospel and Epistle? Present, no doubt, is the official character of this Sonship. He reveals the Father and mediates life to men. But almost invariably the context show the author to be making prominent the *nature* of the Son. Because He is the eternal Logos, or Son, He reveals God and gives life to men. This is conceded by almost all experts on John's writings. A few would limit the Sonship in the Fourth Gospel to ethical kinship with God. Beyschlag[146] speaks of the Son

as a "Confidant" of the Father, and His pre-existence as "ideal" in the mind of God, or "imagined" by John. On the other hand, most writers of New Testament Theology, Immer,[147] Scholten,[148] Weiss,[149] Stevens,[150] Schlatter,[151] Adeney,[152] Gould,[153] Sheldon,[154] and most expositors,[155] think the term "Son," as well as the term Logos, connotes a personal eternal pre-existence and *"implies,* though it does not necessarily assert, a metaphysical relationship." Scott[156] speaks of the Son as "identical with the Logos," and of "the Logos as a supernatural being who makes God manifest because He partakes Himself of the Divine essence." There can be little doubt that John is presenting the Son in "a personal relationship" with God which existed prior to the incarnation; yea prior to the "beginning" of creation.[157] This conclusion is in accordance with the facts in both the Gospel and the Epistle.[158]

(3) *The Human Jesus.* In the Gospel Jesus is represented as using of Himself 12 times the title Son of Man (only four less than in the Gospel of Mark). As Scott aptly infers: [159] "It denotes the acknowledgement on the part of Jesus of a human nature united with a Divine nature." Beyschlag,[160] though minimizing the Divine Sonship of Christ, has done full justice to His humanity. "The Fourth Gospel denies nothing that is innocently human to Jesus, neither hunger nor thirst, nor weariness nor sadness, suffering nor death, nor struggle of soul." On the other hand, Moffatt[161] minimizes the humanity of Jesus in the Gospel but magnifies it in the Epistle. He admits that "the Christ (of the Gospel) is still subject to the natural laws of the world, to space and time, to weariness and thirst, grief, joy, and indignation. But the tendency to obliterate the features of surprise, ignorance, mistake, and disappointment reaches its climax in the Fourth Gospel, and one result is that the unspeakable gains in our conception of Christ are accompanied by a certain lack of the homeliness and definite human charm with which the earlier synoptists invest his person."[162]

An inductive study of the twelve references[163] shows that the Divine origin of the Son of man is taken for granted. He is the Son of Man; eternally He was the Son of God. "He gave His only Begotten Son." As we found in Mark's Gospel,[164] the two terms are used in the same contexts. For instance:— As son of man He is "lifted" upon the cross, but in the very next verse[165] He is "His only Begotten Son" whom the Father

"gave" for the life of the world. In 5:25-27, He is the Son of God and as such has "life" in Himself, but is also Son of man, and as such He "judges" men. That is, as the incarnate Son, or the Son of man, He is the perfect Revealer of God's love and righteousness, and so because men through Him can know God, He has the authority to "judge" them. He has the authority to give life, because He is the Son of God; He has the authority to "judge" men, because He is the Son of man. The two titles emphasize different phases of the functions of the Logos.

Furthermore, it is to be noted that the Gospel puts the supreme emphasis upon the heavenly Son, the eternal Logos; the Epistle, upon the earthly Jesus and His real humanity. The thesis of the Gospel is to prove that the historical Jesus is the eternal Son (Logos); the thesis of the Epistle is to prove that the eternal Son is the historical Jesus who is a real man.

(4) *The Suffering Redeemer.* Although this feature of the Christ-portrait is not colored as in Paul and Hebrews, and the Apocalypse, yet the Christ of John is emphatically the suffering Redeemer. He is "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world."[166] He "must be lifted up" on the cross that men, by faith in Him, "might not perish but have eternal life."[167] As a grain of wheat must "die" in order to "bring forth much fruit," so must the Son of man be "lifted up"[168] in order to be "glorified" in "drawing all men unto Himself."[169] "He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the whole world."[170] God manifested His love in "sending forth His only Begotten Son as the propiation for our sins."[171]

7 *Resumé.*

(1) From the Christ of the Logia and of Mark is a long and marked development in Christology. In the Logia and Mark there is no emphasis upon, nor a direct implication of, the "metaphysical" Sonship, while the Fourth Gospel, in clear, unmistakable language, presents the eternal Sonship as the climax of the Christological development.

(2) Although Paul and the author of Hebrews before him, heavily colors the features of the Heavenly Christ, John goes beyond both in stressing the eternal Sonship and essential Deity of Jesus.

(3) Paul and the author of Hebrews put the greater emphasis upon the present exaltation of the Son, but John stresses rather His past eternal exaltation.

(4) John colors much more lightly than the author of Hebrews the *Human Jesus;* somewhat more lightly than Paul; except in the Epistle in which he emphasizes the *reality* of *His humanity.* However, both in the Gospel and in the Epistle he follows these two predecessors in identifying the eternal Son with the historical Jesus. As did both of them, he constructs his Heavenly Christ on the pillars of the earthly Jesus; as in both of them, the historical Jesus is the incantation of the *Heavenly Christ.*

(5) John colors much more lightly than the author of Hebrews the features of the *Suffering Redeemer;* even more lightly than Paul. The incarnate Son is the Saviour of the world; He is the propitiation for the sins of the world; yet in John, the *Son* is pre-eminently the Revealer of God and the Medium of spiritual and moral life to men.

(6) John outdoes Paul and the author of Hebrews in making Christ the incarnate Son the essence of Christianity, and in making Christianity a vitally spiritual and ethical religion.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XII

1. Cf. ch. I for the line up of scholars on this question.
2. So Lange, Baur, Volkmar, Strauss, Holtzmann, J. and O., Davidson, Matthew Arnold, Pfleiderer, N. Schmidt, Schmiedel, Martineau, Scott, Wellhausen, Wendt, Soltau; cf. Moffatt, INT, 589f.
3. Cf. our ch. X.
4. Cf. art. Gnostics in HRE by Scott; Peake, ib. ch. XIV; Moffatt, ib. pp. 525 ff; Zahn, ib. III, 299 ff. See also Bacon, ib.; Scott, ib.; Burney, ib.; Garvie, ib. et al.
5. Cf. art, Docetism in HRE; Brooke, First Ep. of Jno. in ICC.
6. Ch. III. 7. See our ch. V.
8. Cf. Glover, The Jesus of History, '17, pp. 215ff.
9. Ib. 525. 10. The Fourth Gospel, pp. 101, 156, 296f.
11. Bib. Th. II. 318. 12. N. T. Th. II. 415. 13. Th. of N. T. II. 105 f. 14. Th. of N. T. 567. 15. N. T. Th. 318 ff.
16. Christus, '09, thinks John "goes beyond Paul" in making Christ "God," but feels that he, in doing so, "is pious and dependent on God."
17. Art. Logos, HDB. 18. Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel, '22. 19. The Beloved Disciple, '23.
20. Belief in Christ, p. 115f.
21. Com., Intro.; comments on prologue.
22. II. 341, n. 23. Th. of N. T. 565, 577. 24. Com. p. 134.

25. II. 410. 26., Art. Logos, Int. St. Bib. Enc.
27. The Origin of the Prologue to St. John's Gospel, '17.
28. ib. 29. ib. p. 118. 30. Intro. p. 522.
31. ib. pp. 159, 339, etc.
32. Vie Jesu, tr. Life of Jesus. 33. Bib. Th. pp. 351 ff.
34. Einl. 722 f. 35. N. T. Th. II. 510 ff.
36. 14:6-8; 17:3, etc. 37. 1:17, 18. 38. 3:14-16.
39. Das Johannes-evang. 6 f. 40. ib. 533f. 540 f.
41. ib. III. 273.
42. II. 417. 43. II. 167. 44. Die Aufgaben der N. T. Wiss. in d. Gegenwart ('08).
45. The Gospels as Historical Documents, pt. III.
46. ib. 31f. 47. Quatriéme Evangile, '03, pp. 15f., 76f., 284
48. ib. 351-507. 49. ib. II. 338. 50 ib. above.
51. Cf. von Soden, Hist. of Early Chr. Lit., '06.
52. Cf. 1:1-3 with 1:14f. and I Jno. 1:1-3.
53. ib. II. 513 ff. 54. II. 510 ff. 55. p. 522.
56. ib. 46f. 57. The Fourth Gospel, p. 7.
58. Beiträge zur Weiterentwicklung, '05 (Essay on N. T.). Cf. also Jülicher, Einl., et al., who take a similar view.
59. Kyrios Christos, '14, '21, kap. 5. 60. ib as above.
61. ib. p. 114.
61. ib. p. 114.
62. Cf. Moffatt, ib. 63. II. 341f. 64. II. 422.
65. p. 580. 66. Com. (Prologue). 67. Com. (Intro. and Prologue).
68. Com.
69. EGT. on 1:1, 2. 70. Intro. III. 315 ff.
71. Einl. 430 f. 72. La Doc. du Logos, etc.
73. Die Religiösen Bewegung innerhalb d. Judentums in Zeitalter Jesu, '05.
74. ib. esp. chs. II, IV, V. 75. Jno. 6.
76. p. 156; on p. 154, he speaks of John's being "acquainted with the works of Philo" (doubtful).
77. ib. 522-4. 78. N. T. Th. 638ff; cf. also Weinel, ib.
79. ib. 32f. 80. Ursprung, etc. I. 318f.
81. ib. p. 118. 82. Similar view held by Drummond, Philo Judaeus; Siegfried, Philo von Alexandria, s. 145 ff., who thinks of "a common stock of ideas," and possibly the influence of Palestine on Philo; also Ritter, Philo u. die Halacha, etc. (1879); also Reitzenstein, Zwei Religionsgeschichtliche Fragen (1901).
83. Untersuchungen über d. Entstehung d. vierten Ev. '02, s. 33ff., gives the "parallels"; s. 129 f. emphasizes the "differences."
84. History of Dogma, pp. 97, 114. 85. INT, p. 200f.
86. ib. p. 156, etc. 87. 3:14-16.
88. ib. 525, 528, 127ff.; 228 ff.
89. Cf. art. in Expos.6 IV. 127ff.; 228ff.
90. EGT, on 1:1. 91. 1:4; cf. also Norden, II. 472f. who sees considerable Stoic influence on John.

92. Art. The Stoics, HRE; he claims, on the other hand, there was an ethical influence of Judaism on Stocism.
93. Das Evangelium d. Wahrheit, etc. vol. I. '00; vol. II. '05.
94. Einl. 722 f. 95. ib. 645 f. 96. p. 95.
97. ib. p. 96f.
98. p. 98; cf. Peake, ib.; Feine, Einl.; Burney, ib.; Garvie, ib.
99. Cf. Scott, ib. who correctly denies that the mystery religions made much contribution to the Christology of John. So Krebs, Logos der Heiland, '10, but Mead, Thrice Greatest Hermes, '09, and Reitzenstein, Poimandres, '04, emphasize their influence on John; so Grill, Unterscuh. über d. Entstehung d. Vierten Ev. II. Teil, D. Mysterian—Kleinasiat. Chr. '23.
100. 1:1-18. 101. Referred to in Jno. 1:1-4; so most expositors, Huther, Haupt, Weiss, Briggs, Plummer, Stevens, Brooks, Smith (EGT) et al. (de Wette and Westcott, contra.).
102. Cf. Scott, p. 147; Moffatt, p. 523; Dods, EGT, on 1:1; Arnold, ib. above. 103. 8:4, 23, 30, 31, etc.
104. 7:10, 10, 25-29. 105. So Drummond, Philo Judaeus; also art. Philo, HDB; so Scott, p. 156; cf. Siegfried, et al.
106. p. 523. 107. Cf. Moffatt, p. 523; cf. Strachan, The Idea of Pre-Existence in the Fourth Gospel, AJ Th. 81-105.
108. Cf. Meyer, Godet, Westcott, Dods, on 1:1. 109. 1:1a. cf. 1:18. 110. Cf. Robertson, Gram. p. 622f. 111. Ps. 81 (82)6.
112. Ps. 8:5.
113. Ac. 14:17; 19:26; 4:8, etc.
114. δεύτερος Θεός, second God; cf. Leg. alleg. ch. 73; de Som. ch. 39, in I, 128, 6, 55; cf. Euseb. Praep. Evang. VII. 13 for in Philo.
115. Cf. Pfleiderer, The Early Christian Conception of Christ p. 148f.; cf. Dio Cassius, ed Becker, II. 253; Suetonius, Nero, 13, 30; British Museum, No. 994 (inscription); Harneck, Die Christliche Welt, '99, No. 51. 116. Cf. Weiss, II. 327 ("not a metaphysical relation"); Beyschlag, II. 421 ff.
117. p. 580.
118. Robertson, Gram. pp. 417f. 790f.; Moulton, Proleg. p. N. B.
119. So held by practically all expositors, Luthardt, Godet, Meyer, Westcott, Dods, et al; writers of N. T. Th., Stevens, Adeney, Estes, Gould, Weidner, Feine, Weinel, Scott (14, 51, 195), Pratt, The Deity of Jesus Christ acc. to Gos. of John, '07.
120. Not ὑπὸ but διά; cf. Robertson, Gram. p. 636f. Dods, EGT. 121. Cf. Purves, Logos in HDB; J. Drummond, Philo Judaeus, HDB. vol. V. to see how Philo (de Cherub. ch. 35) ascribes to his Logos the same mediating agency in creation (δι' οὗ).
122. Cf. Paul, Col. 1:16; Heb. 1:2; Rev. 3:14, for exactly the same thought. 123. Cf. Weiss, II. 327 who contests the views of Immer, N. T. Th. 509 for claiming John means a metaphysical relation.
124. Cf. Stevens, p. 585 for similar view to ours above. Cf. de Profugis, ch. 18 ("fountain of Wisdom and life").
125. 1:4. 126. N. T. Th.
127. Bib. Th. II. 128. As de Wette, Meyer, Dods, et al.

129. 1:14, 18. 130. Greek ἐξηγήσατο, v. 18).
131. 1:18. 132. 1:14. 133. ZTK, II. 213f. 134. ib. 155 f. 176f. 135. p. 525. 136. The Philosophy of Faith and the Fourth Gospel, p. 262.
137. Das Ev. d. Joh. 138. p. 176.
139. Camb. Bib. Essays, p. 281f. 140. Cf. Philo. Agric. 6, Loges is Shepherd, Leg. Alleg. III., 59, "sustaining the soul," Migr. Abr. 31, "leader of the way," etc., etc., 141. 5:25-27; 8:36; 17:1, etc.; cf. the "My Father" passages, 8:54; 10:36; 14: 11, 13, etc. 142. 3:16, 36, etc. 143. 2:23, 23; 4:15; 5:5. 144. 1:7; 3:8; 4: 9, 10, 14; 5:5, 20. 145. 4:9, cf. Westcott; EGT. 146. II. 420f. 428f. 147. ib. 509f. speaks of "metaphysical sonship." 148. Das. Ev. Joh. p. 96f. 149. II. 341; cf. 330f. term Θεός means "meatphysical relationship." 150 p. 585. 151. II. 148ff. 152. ib. 153. ib.
154. ib. 155. Luthardt, Godet, Meyer, Westcott, Dods, et al.
156. p. 185f. 157. Scott is sure this is the "author's view"; cf. also Konrad Meyer, Der. Zeugniszweck d. Evangelisten Johannis, '06. 158. 4:9, in which He is called "the only Begotten Son."
159. p. 185f. 160. II. 415f. 161. p. 526f., 586ff.
162. Cf. Bacon, The Fourth Gospel, p. 4; Day, art. The Jesus of the Fourth Gospel, Bib. World, Dec. '09, 410ff., for special emphasis on the differences between the Jesus of the Synoptics and the Christ of John.
163. 1:52; 3:14; 5:27; 6:53, 62; 8:28; 12:23, 34; 13:31.
164. 3:14, 15. 165. 3:16.
166. Jno. 1:29, 36. 167. 3:14-16. 168. I Jno. 12:24-32. 169. Jno. 4:42, I Jno. 4:14.
170. I Jno. 2:2. 171. I Jno. 4:9, 10.

CHAPTER XIII

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

From our study of the historical forces at work; of the psychological principles involved, and the process of development observed in the Christologies of the New Testament, some conclusions can be stated. These follow as logical deductions from the facts presented in the previous discussions.

(1) *Christianity a Historical Religion.* According to the facts disclosed in the above Christological discussions, Christianity is not a larger stream produced by the confluence of several smaller streams in the history of religions. We tried to do justice to the contributions of Judaism and the pagan religions and philosophies—especially, Judaism, the mystery religions, Alexandrianism, Gnosticism, and Stoicism. Although Christianity finds its roots in the soil of Judaism, particularly in the religion of the Old Testament,[1] yet it is not a natural outgrowth and expansion of these. Without Jesus, Judaism could never have flowered into Christianity. It is useless to add that the mystery religions combining with Judaism, Gnosticism and Stoicism, without Jesus of Nazareth, could never have produced the Christianity of the New Testament—in particular its splendid Christology, its spiritual Soteriology, its ethics of personal purity and interracial brotherhood, and its morality of the higher life of love and service. Although the religion of Paul, of the author of Hebrews, and of John must acknowledge as creditors Judaism and the mystery religions, Gnosticism and Alexandrianism, at least as to a few terms and thought-forms, yet it remains an indisputable fact that Christianity is a new movement in the history of the World's religions and morals.

Jesus, a historical character, put in motion this movement in religious thought and life. The synoptists relate the story of the earthly life of the historical Jesus. They were impressed that he had a filial, prophetic, and messiainic consciousness, and that He felt He was "doing the Father's will" in starting this

new movement. Especially are Mark and Luke convinced that the historical Jesus is putting the new wine into new wineskins.[2]

Although Paul, the author of Hebrews, and John make their Christologies centre about the eternal Son and Logos, yet they identify the eternal heavenly Son with the historical human Jesus. Especially is the author of Hebrews emphasizing the historical fact of the suffering human Jesus. And John, in the First Epistle, even more uncompromisingly, champions the reality of the humanity of the historical Jesus. So it is an accepted proposition even with the transcendent Christology makers of the latter half of the first century, that Jesus is a historical character and Christianity is a historical religion.

(2) *Christology the Heart of the Christian Teachings.* To the early Christians and the later Christology makers Jesus Himself is "the way, the truth, and the life." He is the centre from which radiate all the energies and achievements of the new movement. He is the core of theology and the soul of ethics.

The new theology of the early Christians roots itself in the doctrine of the person and mission of Jesus; in their impressions of who He is and what He came to do. The God of the early Christians is the Father, the God of grace and love and mercy. This doctrine of God was elaborated and adopted by the early Christians, by Paul, the author of Hebrews, and John, because of what they knew Jesus was and said and did. Jesus as the Son and Logos made God known to them as the Father. So the early and later apostles and teachers made the love and grace of God the origin, dynamic, and essence of the Christian religion.[3]

The doctrine of salvation grows out of their impression of Jesus' person and mission. To Mark and Matthew and Luke He is the Saviour from sin, the Saviour of the lost; to the early church there is salvation in no other; to Paul He is the Redeemer and Reconciler; to the author of Hebrews He is the High Priest who opens up the way to God and brings men into the Holy of Holies of the Divine presence; to John He is the Saviour of the world. Because He is the Son He is the Saviour; because He loves sinners and sacrifices Himself for them, the way of salvation is felt to be the way of grace and faith. Men are "saved to completeness" only by trusting the grace and

mercy of God, by clinging to the love and friendship of Jesus, and by living the Christ-life of love and service. Thus the early and later apostles reasoned in the light of their experience.

Of course, the New Testament anthropology was developed out of its Christology. Jesus was first seen as the Son and Saviour; then man was seen as a sinner needing to be saved. Jesus was first known as the Redeemer and Reconciler; then men were recognized as having need of reconciliation with God.[4]

(3) *The Exaltation of Jesus Christ Grounded in His Humiliation as the Suffering Jesus.* Even in the Synoptics, not to mention Paul, the author of Hebrews, and John, we find this elemental principle of New Testament Christianity. Jesus is the Son who heals the sick and serves the helpless and gives His life a ransom for many. But the Jesus who served His fellows and suffered on the cross rose from the dead and ascended as Lord. The disciples found this doctrine of exaltation via humiliation in His self-imposed title, Son of Man.[5] But to Paul the exaltation, cosmic and universal, is the logical conclusion of His humiliation and suffering.[6] To the author of Hebrews He is prepared by temptations and sufferings to become the High Priest; by suffering in all points as we do He is "perfected as Son forevermore" to offer Himself as the eternal sacrifice in the very presence of God.[7] To the author of the Apocalypse He is the Lion who conquers because He was the Lamb that was slain.[8] Yea, to all the early Christians and Christology makers Jesus mounted to the throne by way of the cross; He was exalted because he was debased; He was crowned as Lord of lords and King of kings, because He lived and died the Servant of servants and the exponent of self-sacrificing altruism. He obeyed the universal law of morals and religion: He rises highest to reign who stoops the lowest to serve; he *becomes* the greatest of all who *is* the servant of all.[9]

(4) *Christianity the Religion of Experience.* This follows logically inasmuch as it is a historical religion. If the Twelve had had no experiences of Jesus as Friend and Saviour and Lord, they could not have been induced to leave their fishing and other vocations when all seemed lost by His crucifixion. Aided by their former experiences His appearances rekindled the fires of devotion to Him; under the dynamic of the Divine Spirit they experienced fellowship with Him and knew He was still living and walking with them. Especially is experience of

communion with Christ made prominent by Paul and John; to some degree by the authors of Hebrews and the Apocalypse.[10] Paul and John are mystics, but spiritual, "re-acting" mystics.[11] The initiate into the mystery religions was supposed to experience a "deification," and enter by a "new birth" into union with His deity (Attis, Osiris, Serapis, Dionysus, Mithra, etc.) But this union with the god takes place by means of a "blood bath" and a holy supper. That is, union with the gods in the mystery religions takes place by means of ceremonial rites. It is a physical, ritualistic mystical union with the gods. But to Paul and John—yea, to the early disciples—fellowship with God and communion with Jesus was a personal spiritual experience. To be a Christian meant to experience God's forgiving love and a Christ-given rest of soul. Paul's consuming ambition was to "know (by experience) Him and the power of His resurrection."[12] John's slogan in the Gospel was "life" in Him; that is, fellowship with God by believing in Jesus; in the Epistle the slogan is, "Because ye have known Him who is from the beginning; . . . because ye know the Father."[13] Experience of a satisfying trust in Jesus and of fellowship with God through Him; of devotion and sacrificial service for Christ and for others, is the primal differentation of Christianity from all other religions. As Mackintosh so well expresses it:[14] "In its power to do these things—deal adequately with Sin and proffer the supreme religious good, Union with God—Christianity marks a new departure. The experience of the redeeming man is, over against non-Christian life, an original and creative thing."

(5) *The Range of Freedom in New Testament Christological Thinking.* It is patent, even on a casual study of the various Christologies of the New Testament, that the early Christians and later Christology makers enjoyed a remarkable range of freedom in their thinking. Each was a free personality left to his own personal choice of terms and symbols to express his impression of who Jesus is and what He came to do. Paul puts special stress upon the resurrection of Jesus as the chief evidence of His Divine Sonship,[15] and upon redemption and reconciliation as His main task.[16] Luke also, doubtless influenced by Paul, emphasizes the redemptive mission of Jesus and His Lordship as seen in His resurrection and ascension,[17] but, unlike Paul, he stresses the virgin birth to express his impression of Jesus' Divine Sonship.[18] So did Matthew.[19] Not another

writer stresses the virgin birth as an evidence of Jesus' Divine Sonship. Paul refers to some sort of incarnation, but does not designate it as taking place by a birth, and does not urge the manner of His being "born of a woman," His coming "in the likeness of sinful flesh,"[20] as an argument for His Divine Sonship. John emphasizes the pre-existence of the Logos, His being "face to face with God," as the supreme evidence of His Divine Sonship, but also speaks of His being "made flesh."[21] He falls far below the Pauline mark in emphasis upon the redemptive mission of Christ.[22] On the other hand, he stresses the Logos idea of *revelation* as the main mission of the Son, and the idea of "life" as the chief goal of His task.[23] The author of Hebrews adopts other terms, High Priest and sacrifice, to express his impression of Jesus' redemptive work, which he emphasizes even more than Paul. He uses the term Son, and even God, to express his idea of Jesus' personal relationship to God. He goes beyond Paul and John in adopting Greek philosophical terms, "effulgence," "very image," and "substance," to describe the eternal Sonship of Jesus.[24] The author of the Apocalypse adopts the terms Alpha and Omega, Lion and Lamb, Lord of lords, and King of kings, to set forth his idea of Jesus' person and task and conquest of all evil.[25] So we observe a wide range of freedom of thought and freedom of expression allowed to these early Christology makers.

6 *And Yet There is Unanimity on a few Elemental Christological Truths.* In spite of the wide range of freedom divinely guaranteed to the makers of New Testament Christologies, there is to be observed a remarkable unanimity on the central truths of Christology.

(1) *Jesus is recognized as a Divine-human Personality.* This is the conclusion, implied or expressed, of all the writers. The author of the Logia presents Him as the Son of God and the Son of man. So do Mark, Matthew and Luke, the last two making it prominent by relating the account of the virgin birth. The only section of the New Testament Christology which does not emphasize the Divine-human personality of Jesus is that of the early church. The title Son of God (except in Acts 9:20, on the lips of Paul) does not occur in the early chapters of Acts or in the Epistles of Peter and James. However, the Lordship of Jesus is so emphasized that it implies His Divinity.[26] In the epistles of the later Christology makers the Di-

vine-human personality is either placed at the centre of the Christ-portrait or is strongly emphasized. So it is practically a unanimously accepted proposition in the first century, from the writing of the Logia to the completion of the Johannine writings, that Jesus is a Divine-human personality, worthy of worship and praise, and yet susceptible to temptation and obedient to the laws of nature; a real man and suffering everything pertaining to the lot of man.

(2) *Jesus is the Saviour of Men, or the Medium of Spiritual Life to Men.* In the Logia He is the giver of *"rest"* unto the soul[27]; in Mark and Matthew He gives His life a ransom for many[28]; in Luke He is the Saviour of "Sinners"[29]; also in the early Church, while Paul and the author of Hebrews, the author, or authors, of the Johannine writings deeply color the crimson lines of the suffering Saviour; except that John emphasizes His life-giving mission more that His redemptive work.

(3) *Jesus' Lordship is universally recognized.* In the Synoptics He is called Lord. Also in the early church, while the later Christology makers crown Him Lord of individual Christians, Head of the Church, and Lord over earthly dominions and cosmic principalities.[30]

(4) *His death, except possibly in the Logia, is universally conceived of as a means to the messianic salvation.* In the Synoptics it is thought of as a ransom for many and to ratify the covenant; in the early Church it is a part of the Divine program for securing the messianic salvation, while to Paul, the author of Hebrews, and John it is the means of redemption and reconciliation.[31]

(5) *Christ transforms character and life.* This is a latent thought or an emphatic assertion from the Logia to John. Jesus transforms Matthews and Zaccheuses into apostles and generous givers to the poor; sons of thunder into apostles of peace and love; a Saul of Tarsus into an apostle of grace and a martyr to Christ and truth and all the world. This is a differentiating characteristic and a chief glory of Christianity. As Machintosh expresses it:[32] "The new moral dynamic provided by Christianity is owing to the place given to the personality of Jesus. Christian morality is fixed, for good and all, by His precepts and His character. Here was One whose moral powers had never been overtaxed. It was found that He never failed to

lend that strong inspiration upon which weaker natures count." As Glover[33] also well says: "The Christian 'outlived' the pagan; 'out-died' him, and 'out-thought' him." The New Testament Christianity laid the foundation for building characters,[34] the strongest and the most beautiful. Jesus showed the disciples how to live the life of love and His love became the dynamic to transform them and their lives so as to conform to Him and His.

(7) *Divine and Human Co-operation in Making the New Testament Christologies and in Transforming Men.* God and man are partners—in nature and in religion. God works in Man's brains and muscles, in his thoughts and plans and the execution of the same, to build a better physical world in which to live. God also wrought in Matthew and Mark, in Luke and Paul, in the author of Hebrews and John (or Johns) to construct, piece by piece, step by step, the variegated but entirely consistent Christologies of the New Testament. In the Christianity of the first century we find no completed Christology but only fragments of one, each fragment being the product of some Christology maker in whom God, through Christ, was thinking and moving and living. These isolated parts of Christology were not pieces of heaven-made mechanisms dropped ready made into the churches. They were red-hot bits of experience of soul-salvation and character-transformation shaped and tempered in the struggles and persecutions of life. God never works *on* a man as a man works on a machine. God works *on* men by working *in* them. A human personality is a willing Ego and not a passive machine. God's revelations to and operations on a human personality are *reactions* of actions or reflections by the human Ego. However, these actions or reflections by the human Ego are themselves reactions to impressions and actions of God initiated within the individual. The fish and the water, the eagle and the air, are made for each other. So God and man are for each other. As the fish swims in God's ocean and the eagle flies in God's air, so man thinks, reflects, wills and acts as God's Spirit impresses his intellect and feelings and appeals to His will. This co-operation of the Divine and human finds an illustration in Paul who writes,[35] "When it was the good pleasure of God—to reveal His Son *in* me." His Gospel came to him "through revelation of Jesus Christ."[36] God revealed the Son to Paul by impressing him that

Jesus, because He has risen, is the Son of God and the Saviour. The revelation is not complete until Paul commits himself to Jesus as his Lord and Saviour. God initiated the impressions; Paul yielded thereto and thus the portrait of Jesus the Son and Saviour and Lord is seen and is ready for its painting in his epistles.

So may men today yield to God's in-working truth and Spirit and make their own Christologies—impressions and conceptions of Jesus—but at the same time, if they cultivate by faith communion with the living Christ, they are making lives and growing personalities which shall some day be like the object of their trust and love and aspirations. God and men worked together in the first century to given expression to their impressions of Jesus and to polish the diamonds in the rough, so as to reflect the character and glory of Christ. So can God work in the intellects and lives of moderns to interpret Jesus Christ, in terms of today, to modern lovers of truth. However, we must be sure that we understand the historical Jesus of the New Testament and then be faithful to the portraits given therein, so as to reproduce and offer to men today the Christ who is the Son of God and the Son of man; the sympathizing Friend who loves and saves, inspires and transforms, all who respond to Him in personal trust and devotion.[37]

(8) *Christianity an Assimilating Religion.* The Christianity of the first century combated the evil but assimilated the good. It was a movement in history, but it was more; it was an inner life which had sufficient combative and assimilative power to cope with any environment and continue to live and expand. Through Paul it met the Judaizers; through John and Paul it met the Gnostics; through the author of Hebrews it met Greek culture and philosophy. It so adjusted itself to the historical environment in each case that it used a few thought-forms and expressions from each, but put into them a content which is merely a re-interpretation of the historical Jesus in the light of new experiences, in the struggle with error and evil, of the indwelling Christ who solved for them all questions and gave them victory over all error and enemies. Paul assimilated into his Christology the Pharisaic idea of right-standing with God, but in the light of his experience he conditioned that right-standing on man's personal committal to Christ and not on

perfect obedience to the law. He also adapted to his Christological conceptions such Gnostic or mystery terms as "mystery," "knowledge," "fulness," etc. The author of Hebrews adapted to his *proof* of the superiority of Christ's priesthood the Philonic concept (borrowed from Plato) that *the real* exists in heaven and things on earth are *mere "copies"* of the real. John adapts the Gnostic terms "logos," "know," "life," "light," etc., so as to give a modern expression (modern to his readers) of his impressions of the eternal Son.[38] So even in the New Testament times Christianity proved to be a life, first spiritual but also intellectual and ethical, which held within itself the power to adjust itself to everchanging conditions, a power able to combat error and evil but able also to assimilate from Judaism or from pagan religions and philosophies anything which helped to *interpret* Jesus and to make Him known and loved and obeyed. This is a worthy example for men of *these* and *all* future times to follow.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XIII

1. Cf. chs. IX-XII, for influence of O. T. on Paul, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and on the author, or authors, of the Johannine writings.
2. Cf. chs. V and VII above.
3. Cf. chs. IX-XII above, see Rom. 5:8; Jno. 3:16, I Jno. 3:1, 9, 10, etc.
4. Cf. esp. Lk. 15; Rom. 1:18-3:20; 3 and 4; Jno. 3:18, 19.
5. Cf. ch. IV above.
6. Phil. 2:9f. "Wherefore," etc.
7. 2:10; 5:8-10; 7:28; 9:12, 25.
8. 5:5, 6.
9. Cf. Mk. 10:35-45.
10. Cf. chs. IX-XII above.
11. Ch. III above.
12. Phil. 3:10.
13. Jno. 3:36, etc.; I Jno. 2:13ff.
14. The Originality of the Christian Message, p. 110; cf. the whole of ch. IV, a masterpiece on "redemption as an experience."
15. Rom. 1:4; I Cor. 15, esp. vv. 1-17.
16. Rom. 3: 21-26; 2 Cor. 5:14; Gal. 3:13; 4:4.
17. Ch. 15; 19: 1-10; ch. 24.
18. Chs. 1 and 2.
19. Chs. 1 and 2.
20. Gal. 14:4; Rom. 8:3.

21. 1:1, 14.
22. Cf. 1:29, 36; 3:14-16; 12:24-32, I Jno. 2:2; 3:9f. for its presence in John.
23. 1:18, 10:10; 14: 6-11.
24. Cf. esp. 1:3, and chs. 7-9.
25. Cf. ch. XI above. 26. Cf. ch. VIII; cf. McGiffert, The God of the early Christians, chs. I and III.
27. Mt. 11:28 f. 28. Mt. 20:28; Mk. 10:45. 29. Ch. 15:19: 1-10; 23: 42 f.
30. Cf. chs. VIII-XII.
31. Cf. chs. V-XII.
32. ib. p. 149.
33. Ib. p. 200.
34. Cf. Gal. 2:20; Rom. 5:4-8. 2 Cor. 5:4 ff. 5:14 ff.
35. Gal. 1:15, 16. 36. Gal. 1:12.
37. Cf. J. H. Chambers Macaulay, The Reality of Jesus, '21, Introduction and chs. I-IV, XV and XX for emphasis on human personality as the meeting-place of God and man in testing "The Reality of Jesus."
38. Cf. Chs. IX-XII above.

ABBREVIATIONS

In addition to the customary abbreviations of the books of O. T., N. T., and extra-canonical literature, we use the following:—

A

Abs. ..... Abschnitt (section).
Ad loc. ..... ad locum (at the text quoted).
AJ Th. ..... American Journal of theology.
Apoc. ..... Apocalypse.
Apol. ..... Apologetics.
Apos. ..... Apostolic, apostolische.
Apos. Zeitalt ..... Apostolische Zeitalter.
App. ..... appendix.
Art., arts. ..... article, articles.
Aufl. ..... auflage (edition).

B

Bib. ..... Bible.
Bib. Th. ..... Biblical Theology or Biblical Theology of the New Testament.
Bib. Wo. ..... Biblical World.
Bibliog. ..... bibliography.
Bk. ..... book.

C

Camb. Bib., or C B ..... Cambridge Bible.
Can. ..... canon.
Cent. or Cy. ..... Century
Cent. Bib. ..... Century Bible.
Cf. ..... compare.
Ch. or chap. ..... chapter.
Ch. ..... church.
Chr. ..... Christian, Christianity, Christliche.
Chron. ..... Chronologie, Chronicle.
Com., comm., coms. ..... commentary, commentaries.
Crit. ..... critical, criticism.

D

d. ..... der, die, das, dem, den.
DCG. ..... Hasting's, Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels.
Diat. ..... Diatessaron.
Div. ..... division.
Doc. ..... doctrine.

E

Ed ..... edition, edit, editor.
En. Bib. ..... Encyclopaedia Biblica.
EGT. ..... Expositor's Greek Testament, ed. Nicoll.
Einl. ..... Einleitung (Bleek, Credner, Zahn, Jülicher, Belser, Feine, et al.)
Emph. ..... emphasize, etc.
Ep., Eps. ..... epistle, epistles.
Esp. ..... especially.
Ev. ..... Evangelium; evv. evangelien.
Exc. ..... except.
Expos. Times ..... The Expository Times.
Expos. ..... The Expositor.
Exp. or Expos. Bib. ..... Expositor's Bible.
Et. al. ..... and others (et alii).

F

f. ..... following (in paging).
Fol. ..... follow, follows.

G

Gesch. ..... Geschichte (history).
Gos. ..... Gospel.
GHD. ..... The Gospels as Historical Documents, Stanton, I. 1903; II. 1909.
Gram. ..... Grammar.
Grk. ..... Greek.
Grk. Test. ..... Greek Testament.

H

HDB ..... Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible.
HE, ... Eusebius' Ecclesiastica Historia.
Hib. Jour. Sup. ..... The Hibbert Journal Supplement.
Hist. ..... History.
HJP, The History of the Jewish People, Schürer.
HRE. ..... Hastings, Dictionary of Religion and Ethics.
Hsg. ..... herausgegeben (edited).

I

ib. or ibid, ... the same (books as formerly quoted).
ICC, ... International Critical Commentary, ed. Briggs, Driver, Plummer.
INT, or Intro. ..... Introduction.
Int. St. Bib. Enc. ..... International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia.

J

JE ..... Jewish Encyclopaedia
Jo. or Jour. Bib. Lit ..... Journal of Biblical Literature, pub. by Society of Bib. Lit. and Exegesis.

K

Kap. ..... Kapitel (chapter).
Kom. ..... Kommentar.

L

Lex. ..... Lexicon.
Lit. ..... Literature, or literarische, or litteratur.

M

Med. Lang. ..... Medical Language.
Mes. Proph. .....Messianic Prophecy.
Mod. ..... modern.
Moult. and Ged. ..... Moulton and Geden, Concordance to Grk. Test.
Ms., mss. .....Manuscript, manuscripts.

N

Nr. ..... number.
N T ..... New Testament.
N T. Th. ..... New Testament Theology, or Neu Testatament Theologie.

O

Op. cit. ..... work cited.
O T. Th. ..... Old Testament Theology.

P

p., pp. ..... page, pages.

Paul. Th. ..... Pauline Theology, Paulinische Theologie.
Prob. ..... prob.
Pt. ..... part.

R

Refs. ..... references.
Rel. ..... religion, religious.
Rev. ..... Review.

S

s. ..... seite (page).
Sec. ..... section.
Sept. ..... Septuagint.
SK or Stud. u Krit. ..... Studien und Kritiken (Gotha).
So ..... source or sources.
s. v. ..... sub voce.
Syn. ..... Synoptic, Synoptist. Synonyms.
Syn. Gos. ..... Synoptic Gospel (or Gospels).

T

Th., Theol. ..... Theology, or Theologie.
Th. d. N. T. ..... Theologie des Neuen Testament.
Th. Lit. Zeit. ..... Theologische Literaturzeitung (hsg. von Harnack u. Schürer).
Th. of O T. ..... Theology of Old Testament.
Tr. or trans. ..... translation.
T U ..... Texte und Untersuchungen, etc. ed. von Gebhardt, Harnack, und C. Schmidt.

U

U ..... und (and)
Untersuch ..... Untersuchungen.
Urc. ..... Urchristentum (Pfleiderer, J. Weiss, et al).
Ur. Mc. ..... Ur-Marcus.

V

V. B. ..... Virgin Birth.
V or vol. ..... volume.

W

Wiss ..... Wissenschaft.

Z

ZTK .....Zeitschrift für Theologie u. Kirche.
Zw ..... Zweite.

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BT198.W43 1928
Williams, Cha The evolution of New Testa
3 0645 0005 2891 5